AN

ANSWER

TO

Mr. *F. G.* his XL. Queries,

Touching the Lawfulneſs, or unlawfulneſs of holding Church-Communion, between ſuch who have been Baptized after their Beleeving, and others who have not otherwiſe been Baptized, then in their Infancie.

As likewiſe touching Infant, and after Baptiſm.

In which Anſwer, the unduеneſs of ſuch mixt Communion is Declared, the Unlawfulneſs of Infant-Baptiſm, and the neceſſity of after Baptiſm is Aſſerted.

By *W. A.*

GAL. 6. 4, 5.

But let every man prove his own work, and then ſhal he have rejoycing in himſelf alone, and not in another: for every man ſhal bear his own burden.

Printed for the Author. 1653.

LIBRARY OF THE
Union Theological Seminary
NEW YORK CITY
PRESENTED BY
DONOR UNKNOWN
MAY 22 1945

McALPIN
1653
TA432
190467

To the Reader.

Had not the Truth been dearer to me then any man, I should not have appeared so publickly opposite to one, whom I so much love and honour, as I do my worthy good friend the Author of the Queries. But considering that Christ must be followed, owned, and pleaded for, in every Doctrine, dispensation, and command of his, when Providence puts men upon it, though in so doing they are many times forced to break Company, as to some ways, with dearest Relations, and persons of their greatest respects: and considering also, that my self as probably occasioning the birth of the Queries, have a greater engagement upon me then another, to anticipate as much as in me lyes, the dis-service they may do to the truth of Christ, I have therefore the rather thought of returning some Answer to them. In which Answer, my respects to the Querist have caused me to decline all things that might bear hard upon him, so far as my faithfulness to the truth, would well bear at my hands.

There is almost no end of Disputes, and it is not to be imagined what the wit of man can do, towards the making of things which are not, to seem as if they were, and things which are, to appear as if they were not: therefore was it, as it should seem, that Paul *was* jealous with a Godly jealousie over the Corinthians, lest the subtilty of men should carry off their minds from the plainness of the Gospel, 2 Cor. 11. 3. *For however there are deep things of God, that are not obvious to every eye; yet doubtless for things that concern even the meanest Babe in Christ, to beleeve and practise in order to his being numbred with the Saints, such as are the beginning Doctrines of Christ*, as Repentance from dead Works, faith towards God, the Doctrin of Baptisms, *and the like; God hath not been so sparing of his minde hereabout, as that men must make a journey from the one end of the Scriptures to the other, and lay both ends together, before they can discover the mind of God, as a ground of their faith and practise, as some would bear us in hand, even in the business of Baptism it self; as if Christ had made one of the first things a Christian should do, one of the hardest for him to know, whether he should do it so or so: but as concerning the principles of the Gospel, which every Christian must beleeve and submit to*, What saith the Scripture? The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth and in thy heart, that is the Word of Faith which wee Preach, Rom. 10. 8. *Which words (I pray you note) are spoken by the Apostle in opposition to them, who held That the Gospel was not a perfect Rule to a Christian without the Law; as they also do in effect who think the*

Gospel

Gospel Rule for Baptizing Beleevers, is not a perfect Rule to us, but that we must be beholding to the Law of Moses for the Circumcising Infants, to direct us about the Baptizing of children: as if we should ask the twilight in the evening, whether it were light at noon day.

Therefore Reader, let me perswade thee whosoever thou art, not to spend thy precious time and thoughts in following the Wilde-goose-chase of men, in their Meanderous disputes about these things of common observation and practise; but beleeve, and act, according to what thou findest plainly written in the New Testament of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath not left his last Wil and Testament behinde him in any such dubious Words, as might occasion his children to fall out about it, but that an evil spirit many ages ago got into the Churches, (of which many good men, perhaps scarce any, are totally dispossessed unto this day) which for some carnal respect, turned them aside from the plain way of the Gospel, into wayes and practises of their own chusing, which that afterwards they might make good and justifie, they, and those that tread in their steps, have strained their wits to find out Arguments and Plea's, that have so darkned and obscured things that otherwise of themselves were lightsome and plain, that it now proves a hard matter for many, to discern what is of Christ, and what is but of man.

And thus if thou doest, thou shalt not need to burden thy self with far fetcht Arguments, to prove that to be lawful, which thou doest not finde plainly written as many do; for thou wilt not need to Question at all, whether

whether that way is lawful or no which thou findest beaten by the feet of the Saints of old, with the high approbation of heaven: and why should any man go about, when a nearer way presents it self to him?

Let that therefore abide in you, which ye have heard from the begining: if that which ye have heard from the begining remain in you, ye also shal continue in the Son, and in the Father. 1 *John* 2. 24.

[redacted]

AN

[redacted]

ing Beleevers, because of that dis-union and disturbance it occasions, even among Beleevers themselves. Let such consider,

1 THat *One-nesse in minde and affection, is as wel the sin of the Anti-christian party in one respect, as it is the Duty of (christians in another:* Rev. 17. 13. These have one minde, and shall give their strength and power unto the Beast. 2. *It is onely one-nesse in the truth then, that is commendable and desireable. If so, then,* 3. *It is not those that keep close to the Doctrine of the New Testament and the laudable practise of the Saints, as at the begining, as the Baptists do, that are to be charged with division making, but those that divide from the plain way of the Gospel, and those that walk in it.* Rom. 16. 17. Marke them which cause divisions and offences, contrary to the Doctrine which ye have LEARNED, and avoyd them. 4. *Truth is to be preferred before peace; and heavenly wisdome is more, and better known by Truth, then by Peace:* Jam. 3. 17. The wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable. *Truth may not be balked, or sold at any rate, no not for peace it selfe:* Pro. 23. 23. Buy the truth and sell it not: Gal. 2. 5. To whom we gave place by subjection, no not for an hour, that the truth of the Gospel might continue with you. 5. *Such whose ground on which they stand, is truth, though they ought with all sweetnesse, love, and meeknesse, to invite and perswade others to come over to them, yet may by no means depart thence, or remove their standing, no though it were to gain others to them.* 1 Cor. 9. 21. To them that are without Law, as without Law (being not without Law to God, but under the Law to Christ) that I might gain them that are without Law. Jer. 15. 19. Let them return to thee, but return not thou unto them. Phil. 3. 15, 16. If in any thing ye be otherwise minded God shal reveal even this unto you: Nevertheless, whereto we have already attained, let us walk by the same rule, let us minde the same thing. 6. *Though* endless Genealogies, and striving about the Law, and the eating of meats and herbs, *are but such things, and the truth concerning them, but of that nature, as that for the sake thereof, peace must not be broken* (Tit. 3. 9. 1 Tim. 1. 4. Rom. 14.) *yet first, such points or questions, as concern the fulfilling of any righteousnesse* (*of which those that concern the essentials of Baptisme are, Mat. 3. 15.*) *are such as of which the Kingdom of God*

Secondly, not onely Gospel Doctrines about matters of faith, but also matters of Gospel order, such as the Apostle calls Ordinances, appointments, *or* traditions. 1 Cor. 11. 2. *even these are truths to be contended for, and not to be let go for peace sake. And the Apostle thought this a sufficient answer to such as should contend against these* viz. *that they had no such custome, neither the Churches of God, ver.* 16. *with ver.* 2, 3, 4, 5. *&c. And if the Churches of God, then, had no such custom neither, as to sprinkle or Baptise little children, or to admit members to Church-communion without Baptisme, does not the Apostles saying, here, though produced upon another occasion, evince their contention, sinful and unreasonable likewise, that shal plead for and practise such things as these, contrary to the custom of the first Churches, which in all laudable things were patterns to al succeeding Churches? The Apostle having in* 2 Thes. 2. *given notice of the Mystery of iniquity its begining then to work, ver.* 7. *and the coming of the man of sin, with all deceiveableness of unrighteousness, ver.* 10. *which we know in the Papal Apostacy, hath fallen out as wel in matters of Gospel order, as in points of faith; he to prevent a defection in both, exhorts them ver.* 15. *to stand fast and to hold the Traditions which they had been taught; yea and in chap.* 3. *v.* 6. *counts that a disorderly walking, which was not after the Tradition which they had received from the Apostles. And if it were the wisdom and duty of the Churches then, to stand fast, and to hold fast the Traditions which they had received from the Apostles, as wel touching matters of Gospel Order as otherwise to prevent their falling into Anti-christian pollutions, then doubtless, the way for men now, to recover themselves and others from under those pollutions, is by returning back to these Apostolical traditions, and standing fast in them, which doubtless is their duty, what disturbance soever may follow thereupon.*

ERRATA.

PAge 9. l. 15. r. *those particular cases*, p. 25. l. 21. r. *neither*, p. 44 l. 13 r. *a*, r. 49. l. 25. r. *supposing*, p. 52. l. 1. r. *formally*, ib. l. 4. r. *is*, p. 55. l. 16. r. *such as have*, p. 55 l. 24. r. *the time of his Baptism*, p. 57. l. 25. r. *and* p. 58. l. 24. r. *of*. 59. l. 14. r. *describes*, p. 59. l. 32. r. *those*, p. 60. l. 6. r. *words*, p. 61. l. 16. r. *that*. p. 61. l. 26. r. *of* p. 61. l. 28. r. *when*, p. 63. l. 3. r. *is*, p. 64. l. 14. r. *unreasonable*, p. 66. l. 1. r. *much*, ib. l. 3. r. *baptised*. ib. l. 14. r. *meet*, p. 69. l. 26. r. *those*, p. 72. l. 32. r. *charging*, p. 72. l. 39. r. *that* p. 72. l. 19. r. *practise it*.

AN

An Answer to Mr. I. G. his XL. Queries, *touching Church-Communion between such as have been Baptised after they have Beleeved, and others who have not otherwise been Baptised then in their Infancie. As likewise touching Infant and after Baptism.*

THe thoughts of the Worthy Author of the Book Intituled *Philadelphia*, touching the subject matter of that Book, being propounded Queri-wise, there is I suppose little Question to be made, but that it was with an expectation on his part, to receive a return from the hand of some friend, or other, in order to a further Discovery of Truth in that particular Case of Conscience, about which the Queries are imployed. And therefore rather then the desire of this worthy friend, should in this behalf be kept too long fasting, I have resolved (having first waited a while for some more able hand to have undertaken it) through the assistance of God, to offer my mite towards this service, to which I address my self as follows.

Quære. I.

Whether is there any Precept or example in the Gospel of any Baptized Person, his disclaiming of Communion in Church-fellowship, with those whom he Judges true Believers upon account only of their not having been Baptized?

Respondent.

As for matter of Example for such a practise, there is I suppose none in Scripture, no more then there is of disclaiming communion with the Church of *Rome*, as now it is, or with the the Parochial Churches in *England* or elsewhere; and yet it wil not follow, that the one is any more unlawful then the other. For Scripture examples are matters of Fact, and therefore, there having been no such corrupt practise crept into the world, till after all the books of the holy Scriptures were finished, as is the constituting of Churches without Baptism, or upon Infant sprinkling instead of Baptism, which in true construction is not onely no Baptism at all, but even worse then none, as much as to commit an evil action is worse then to omit a good one; there being, I say, no such corruption as this then on foot, no more then there was the now Romish, the National, or Parochial Church-constitution then in being, there could be no occasion for any truely Baptized person, to disclaim communion, either with the one or with the other; and consequently no such matter of Fact to be Recorded, of which to make an example.

But then it no more follows, that it is unlawful to refuse communion with the one Church, then it is with the other, if there be no more ground in Scripture to constitute Churches without Baptism, then there is for the Romish, National, and Parochial constitution. The Queriſt then having himself disclaimed communion with the Church of *Rome*, and the Parochiall Churches in *England*, though he have no example in scripture so to do, and yet hath done it, because there is no example in Scripture for such Church-constitution as that of *Rome* and *England* is, he might as well disclaim communion with Churches

Churches built upon Infant Baptism too, since there is no more example in Scripture of such a Church constitution, then there is of the constitution of those Churches, with whom he hath disclaimed communion; especially considering, that there is example in abundance in Scripture of Churches of a better constitution, and that is of Saints Baptized after they had Believed.

2. As to matter of Precept; though there be no litteral or syllabical Precept for Baptized persons to disclaim communion in Church-fellowship with unbaptized ones, no more then there is for disclaiming communion with the false Churches before mentioned; yet if the Querist will say, that there is Precept in Scripture, which does virtually require him to disclaim communion with the Church of *Rome*, and the Parochiall Churches in their way, then *I* will say the same concerning Baptized Believers, their refusing communion with unbaptized.

If it be demanded, what precept doth virtually require such a thing as non-communion of Baptized with unbaptized?

I Answer, 1. For those that plead the Precept of circumcising Infants under the Law, as virtually requiring the baptizing of Infants under the Gospel, me thinks this should be satisfactory as to them, and so to the Querist himself, as touching the Case in hand, *viz.* where God requires Circumcision under pain of being excluded communion with the Church, saying, *the uncircumcised man-child, whose flesh of his fore-skin is not circumcised, that soul shal be cut off from his people, Gen.*17.14. for what lesson can be meant by that expression, *shal be cut off from his people*, then that such an one should be deprived communion with the people of *Israel* in Church-fellowship? *If* it be said a cuting off by death, is thereby intended, then *I* say, that is exclusive of Church-communion likewise; for the Major includes the Minor, and it is more to be cut off by the hand of death, from all opportunity of future communion with the Church, then it is for a man to be debarred present communion, onely in order to his repentance, that he might be regularly capable of communion afterwards.

But whether such a cuting off be in that place intended or no most certain it is, that such a cuting off is enjoyned, *Exod.*12.48. where its said, speaking of the Passover, *That no uncircumcised person shal eat thereof.*

Library of the UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

And therefore, if it be good reasoning from circumcision to Baptism, (which if it be not, let the Pedobaptists bid adieu to their cause of *Infant* Baptism, which is built and bottomed thereupon) then it follows undeniably by way of Analogie, that as uncircumcision by the command of God, did deprive persons of communion with the people of God in Church-fellowship, then, so non-Baptism does debar persons of Church-communion now. And now which of the hornes of this dilemma, will the Pedobaptists suffer themselves to be gored by? Will they say the consequence is not good, to argue the exclusion of unbaptized persons from Church-communion, from the exclusion of uncircumcised persons from acts of Church-communion, while circumcision was in force; if so, then how can the consequence be good, to argue the Baptism of *Infants* from the circumcision of *Infants*; for the same things have the same consequences; and to things alike, belongs the like reason and judgement, and therefore let them either grant my inference, or for ever cease any more to infer from *Infants* circumcision, to *Infants* Baptism.

2. *I* would argue further thus: the same Law which enjoynes the learned Querist, and others of his way, to deny the priviledge of their Churches to other Beleevers that are not of their Churches, but do scruple their way, and cannot submit to their order, the same Law does enjoyn baptized beleevers, not to admit into fellowship with them in Church priviledges such persons, though beleevers, as do scruple their order and way of being baptized in order to Church communion, and will not submit thereto. For the Scripture is every whit as expres for Baptism to precede the enjoyment of Church priviledges, as it is for a voluntary consenting to Church order and government, to precede the same enjoyment. Nay *I* am confident, that the Arguments and Plea's, brought to prove it lawful to admit Beleevers to such communion without Baptism, if admited as good, would overthrow and level the Order and Discipline of particular Churches. For if one single person may be admited to Church-priviledges without Baptism, or without submiting to the order and rule of the Church, both which are previous to acts of Church-communion, and I affirm the

case

case is more clear for Baptism in this behalf in Scripture, then it is for that submission and consent I speak of; I say, if one person may be admitted upon such terms, then why not two? if two, why not ten, and so a hundred, or a thousand? and consequently such Gospel order laid totally aside?

3. If these things serve not turn, yet those precepts, exhortations, or doctrines, by which men stand enjoyned to observe Gospel Order (*1 Cor.* 14. 40. *2 Tim.* 1. 13. *2 Thess.* 2. 15. *1 Cor.* 11. *2. Titus* 1. 5. *Col.* 2. 5. *Rom.* 6. 17.) do virtually prohibit men Baptized, communion with unbaptized in Church fellowship, as that which is contrary thereunto.

1. That this was the order of the Gospel, yea and an order enjoyned by Christ, *viz.* that Beleevers should first be Baptized, before admited into Church-fellowship, will sufficiently appear, if duly considered, from that Commission of Christ to his Disciples, *Mat.* 28. 19. *Go ye therefore teach all Nations Baptizing them.* Where we see, that the very next thing they were to do, after they had taught men (*viz.* so, as to make them willing to obey the Gospel, *Acts* 2. 41.) was to Baptize them: which in junction therefore, as some well observe, is put by a participle of the present tense; *Teach all Nations, Baptizing them, &c. i. e.* presently upon their being taught, as all examples of that nature in the Acts of the Apostles do declare. And if this were the very next thing in order to be done, after men were instructed to the beleef of the Gospel, then an admiting them into Church fellowship without this, could not be without a deviation and turning from the rule of Christ in this behalf; which transgression to suppose the Disciples of Christ admiting, or the Disciples admited, to be guilty of, is a peece of uncharitableness, more then I am willing to communicate in.

2. The Apostles, according to the Commandement of Christ, begining first at *Jerusalem* to put this Commission of his into execution, *Luke* 24. 47. did act accordingly. And doubtless their acting upon this Commission, ought to be taken by us, as an interpretation of this Commission, and their actions relating hereto, to be in pursuance of, and correspondent to this Com-

miſſion; unleſs we will ſuppoſe them to ſtumble at the threſhold, and to begin to depart from it aſſoon as they began to act upon it; which would be too great an audacioufnes in any man once to imagine. If ſo, then what is more plain, then that the Commiſſion of Chriſt to them, was to teach and baptiſe firſt, and to admit into Church fellowſhip thereupon, and not otherwiſe; as is viſible in that prime example of theirs, *Acts* 2. 41. 42. *Then they that gladly received his Word, were Baptized, and the ſame day there was added unto them, about three thouſand ſouls. And they continued ſtedfaſtly in the Apoſtles Doctrine and fellowſhip, and in breaking of bread, and in Prayers.* Where you ſee, they were, firſt, taught by Preaching, ſecondly, did gladly receive the Word by which they were taught, thirdly were baptized, fourthly, were added unto them, *viz.* the Church, *ver.* 47. fifthly, continued ſtedfaſtly in the Apoſtles Doctrine and fellowſhip, &c. Addition to the Church then, and fellowſhip in it, did follow baptiſm, and not go before it, according to the actuated commiſſion of Chriſt Jeſus. And why ſhould any ſervants of his, then, deſire to vary from it, unleſs they preſume themſelves wiſer then he, and hope to finde a greater good in their own way, then in his?

3. Baptiſm muſt needs precede the enjoyment of Church priviledge, in Church fellowſhip, in the Apoſtles dayes, becauſe it was then, as it ought ſtill to be, a means of planting men into Chriſt, or into the body of Chriſt the Church. Hence they were ſaid *to be Baptized into Chriſt*, *Galathians* 3. *verſ.* 27. *and to be baptized into his death*, *Romans* 6. *v.* 3. *and to be planted together into the likeneſs of his death, upon that accompt*, *ver.* 5. *of the ſame chapter.* And what does a planting and a planting together import, but the firſt puting together of Chriſtians, in order to their growing together in Chriſt? and yet all this is done by Baptiſm. And may you not therefore, as well ſuppoſe trees to grow together, before they are planted together, as to ſuppoſe Chriſtians to grow together before they are planted together, and yet planted together they are by Baptiſm: not into this or that particular Church, but into that one Church of Chriſt, which is diſtributed into ſeverall parts and particular Societies. Hereupon it is, that Baptiſm is called

one

one of the *Principles, or beginning Doctrines of Christ*, and likewise part of the Foundation, *Heb.* 6. 1, 2. And what house stands without its Principles, or is built without a foundation?

Nay the Apostle 1 *Cor.* 12, 13. doth plainly declare Baptism, to be of so constant and universall a use as to the inchurching of persons of all sorts, ranks, and degrees, that were incorporated at all in his time, as that none came into the Church, but through this door. For he sayes, *they were all Baptized into one body, (i. e.* Church body*) whether Jews or Gentils, bond or free.* And if any man can name any persons, that were neither Jews nor Gentiles, neither Bond nor Free, then I will confess, those possibly might be brought into the Church without Baptism. But otherwise, though they were Jews, and had been formerly entred in their Church by circumcision; yet when they became of the Gospel Church, it was not without Baptism. Or if Gentiles, a people sometimes a far off, yet by Baptism upon their beleeving, were brought into capacity of the same enjoyments with the Jews. If free, as Masters, yet not admitted without Baptism: if bound as servants, yet made equally capable of the same Church priviledges by Baptism: For so he sayes again, *Gal.* 3. 27, 28. *As many of you as have been Baptized into Christ, have put on Christ; there is neither Jew nor Gentile, bond, nor free, male nor female, for ye are all one in Christ Jesus, i. e.* all having thus put on Christ, are become all one in him.

Some indeed seem somewhat to doubt, whether the Apostle speaks of water Baptism, when he sayes, *That by one Spirit we are all Baptized into one body*; or whether he does not rather speak of the Baptism of the Spirit without water.

Though these indeed are the doubtfull thoughts of some, contrary to the generally received opinion of men upon the place, yet I must do my honored Querist that right, as to quit him from fellowship in that opinion, and to acknowledge that he not long since in a discourse upon the same words, did teach the Auditory to understand, by being Baptized by one Spirit into one Body, and by being made to drink into one Spirit, (as is expresst in the latter part of the verse) that the Communion which Beleevers have with the holy Spirit in the two Ordinances, Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord, is intended by the Apostle;

and

and this he did, without doubt to me, according to the truth. For what else can be intended by drinking into one Spirit, but the Saints communion in Spirit in and by the Supper? drinking by a Synecdoche, being put both for eating and drinking. If so, why should we not as well understand the first Ordinance Baptism, in its proper sence for water Baptism in the former part, as the latter Ordinance the Supper, in its proper sence in the latter part of the verse? Neither can we reasonably understand the same thing to be intended by being Baptised by one Spirit, and by drinking into one Spirit, (which yet we must do, if a being indued with the Spirit were all that is here meant,) for they are said to be Baptized into one body, but to drink into one Spirit; and surely Baptizing and drinking here, are no more the same, then the Body and the Spirit are the same, into which they are said respectively to be Baptized, and to drink. But clearly the Apostle seems hereby to intend to minde these *Corinthians*, how that by means of the same spirit working upon all their hearts, they became members of the same body through Baptism, and that being of the Body, they came to have communion in Spirit, or with the Spirit in the supper. And that which will yet further serve to evince, that it is not a Baptism with the spirit, but a Baptism with water that is here meant, is this, because the spirit is here set forth by the Apostle as the Agent or working cause, and Baptism as the effect; and it is ridiculous to make both cause and effect the same thing. It is true indeed, the scripture doth speak of a being Baptized with the spirit; but whenever it does so, it still declares either Jesus Christ, or God the Father, as the Agent Baptizing with the spirit; but never as making the spirit both the subject matter wherewith, and also the Agent whereby men are Baptized in the same Baptism. See for this, *Mat.* 3. 11. *Mark.* 1. 8. *Luke* 3. 16. *Act.* 1. 4. 5. with *Luke* 24. 49. *Acts* 11. 16.

The premises therefore considered, I hope it will sufficiently appear and that to the satisfaction of any indifferent man, that in the primitive times, none were admited to Church-communion without Baptism; and if so, have we in these dayes reason to do any otherwise? Ought not that which was a reason to them not to admit Church-members into Church-fellowship without

without baptiſm, to be a reaſon unto us likewiſe to ſteer the ſame courſe? unleſſe we will ſay, thoſe Goſpell rules by which they ordered themſelves in thoſe times, were binding only to Chriſtians of the firſt age of the Goſpell, but not to us now; and if ſo, then farewell all Goſpell Obligations; for if we may take liberty to caſt away one Law of Goſpell Order, and Worſhip, then why not two, and ſo three, and in the end all? to which indeed theſe leſſer beginnings do truly tend, and I would to God it might be more conſidered, and laid to heart.

Queriſt.

How can this ever be proved, that there were no believers unbaptized in the Apoſtles daies?

Reſpon.

I know none that does affirm any ſuch thing, as that a believer was not at any time while he was a believer unbaptized; nay doubtleſſe men were believers firſt, and then were baptized after they began to believe. But if the *Queriſt* intends thus, how will it be proved, that no believer in Church-fellowſhip was unbaptized? Then the anſwer is, that it is proved by thoſe and the like Scriptures lately quoted, where its ſaid in effect, that all of all ſorts, ranks, and degrees, that were of the body, were baptized into that body, and if all were of the body by it, then none were without it.

Queriſt.

Be it granted, that there were no believers unbaptized in the Apoſtles daies, upon what ground notwithſtanding can the practiſe now queried be juſtified or maintained, unleſſe the practiſers certainly know, and can ſatisfie themſelves, that in caſe there had been ſuch believers in thoſe times (I mean who had been unbaptized, or unduly baptized) thoſe duly baptized would have declined ſuch communion with them, as that ſpecified?

Reſpon.

Believers now, are doubtleſſe no more then believers were then; (I do not mean no more in number) and if ſo, then the ſame ground that did ſatisfie baptized believers then, in not joyning in Church-fellowſhip with perſons unbaptized, though they did believe, untill they were baptized, (for they did believe before they were baptized, and yet were not admitted

mitted into Church communion till after baptized, as was proved above) will serve to satisfie baptized believers now, touching the lawfulness of the same practise, which is the will and appointment of Jesus Christ [illegible]; for in that we find such a thing practised with approbation of the Apostles, we may well conclude it to proceed from their directions and instructions, and consequently from the Lord himself, as we are taught to infer, 1 *Cor.* 14.37.

II. Query.

Whether can it be proved from the Scriptures, or by any argument like to satisfie the conscience of any tender and considering Christian, that the Apostles, or other Christians in their dayes, would have declined Church-communion with such persons, whom they judged true beleevers in Christ, only because they had not been baptized after a profession of their believing?

Respon.

It does not only appear, that the Apostles and other Christians would have declined Church-communion with believers, because not baptized, but it appears they did do it; for it sufficiently appeares that men and women did believe before they were baptized, *Act.* 2.41. & 8.12.37.38. & 18 8. with many other places: And I hope it is proved to satisfaction, in my answer to the first *Query*, that believers were not admitted to Church-fellowship then, till after baptized, their believing notwithstanding; if so, what is a not admitting lesse, then a refusing to admit them to such communion?

The reason why the *Querist* seems to conceive, that the Apostles and other Christians would not have declined Church-communion with believers, only for their want of baptisme, runs thus:

Querist.

Considering that the Apostle Paul *expresly saith,* That in Jesus Christ (*i.e. under the Gospel or profession of Jesus Christ in the world*) neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but faith which worketh by love, Gal. 5.6. *And again,* That circumcision is nothing, nor uncircumcision is nothing, but the keeping of the Commandements of God, 1 Cor. 7.19. *meaning, that under the Gospel, neither did the observation of any*

external

externall Rite or Ceremony, Circumcision by a Synecdoche Speci*e, being but for all kind of externall Rites or ceremonies, avail or contribute any thing towards the commending of any person unto God, nor yet the want of any such observation discommend any man unto God, or prejudice his acceptation with him; but that which was all in all unto men, and which availed any thing in and under the Gospel, that which being found in men, rendred them accepted and approved of God, and the want of it disapproved, was such a kind of faith (not such or such a kind of ceremony, or such or such a kind of baptisme) which by the mediation or intervening of that heavenly affection of love, utereth and expresseth it selfe in* keeping the Commandements of God.

Respon.

1. What does the *Querist* mean, when he says, that under the Gospell the observation of any externall rite or ceremony, avails a man nothing towards the commending of him to God, nor does the want of it prejudice his acceptation with him; does he mean, that it does not avail him in any sense? (as one would suppose, that were minded to take him in the worst sense, since his assertion is indefinite) but surely this is not his meaning, since this would render the Ordinances of the Gospell, Baptisme and the Supper, unprofitable and vaine, and things but of like indifferency, as were those meats of which the Apostle saith, *That if a man eat of them, neither is he the better, or if he eat not, neither is he the worse*, 1 *Cor.* 8. 8.

But I presume rather that he meanes, that they availe not comparatively, or els in the businesse of justification; but what then, will it follow, that because these externall rites, baptism and the like, do not avail unto mens Justification when they are observed, that therefore they are not necessary unto Church-communion? for did the externall Rite of Circumcision under the Law (which is the thing by which the *Querist* calculates the validity of baptism under the Gospell) availe any more to justification, then baptism does now; and yet how irrelative soever it was to justification, yet it was so necessary as to Church-communion, as that Church-communion was not to be had without it, *Gen.* 17. 14. *Exod.* 12. 48. if so, then how can the *Querist* estimate the usefulnesse and disusefulnesse

of baptiſm, as to Church-communion by Circumciſion; as he does, and not conclude it neceſſary to Church-communion as well as Circumciſion was?

But I demand how the Apoſtles or other Chriſtians in their times would have known, or have been able upon good ground to have concluded, that ſuch perſons had truly believed in Chriſt unto juſtification, and had been meet to be admitted to communion with them, who ſhould (if any ſuch had been) have refuſed to obey Chriſt in ſubmitting to baptiſm, whereby they were to make proof that they did believe in him in good earneſt: Sure I am, that a refuſing of *Johns* baptiſm was taken for a declared rejecting the counſell of God in the Goſpel, *Luk.* 7. 30. and how a refuſing the baptiſm of Chriſt, could by the ſame rule be deemed leſſe, I underſtand not, unleſſe you will ſuppoſe that the counſell of God was not in the baptiſm of Chriſt, as well as in the baptiſm of *John*.

2. Why ſhould our *Queriſt* eſtimate the Apoſtles judgment of Goſpel Rites by what he ſpeaks of Circumciſion? ſince the one was aboliſhed, and the other eſtabliſhed by the ſame Goſpell; or does it follow, that becauſe the Apoſtle doth oppoſe Faith to circumciſion, that therefore Faith muſt be oppoſed to Goſpell-Ordinances, or external Rites, as he calls them? does not a Goſpell Faith exclude circumciſion, and yet include baptiſm, as it doth all other precepts of the Goſpel? and therefore pity it is, that ſuch friends as Faith and Goſpell-Rites are, ſhould be ſet together by the ears.

3. Why does the *Queriſt* make circumciſion a Goſpel-Rite, which is indeed a Rite aboliſhed by the Goſpell? or does not he account it a Goſpell-Rite, when he ſayes, that under the Goſpell, circumciſion by a *Synecdoche Specie, is put for all kind of externall rites or ceremonies*; or which I think is the ſame, *that under the Goſpell, and the profeſſion thereof, neither did the obſervation of any externall rite or ceremony, circumciſion by a Synecdoche Specie, being put for all kind of externall rites and ceremonies, &c.* and if for all kind, then certainly for Goſpell-Rites and Ceremonies, for they are ſome of all; neither ſurely would any man (much leſſe the *Queriſt*) be ſo impertinent, as to aſſert no externall Rite available under the Goſpell, becauſe circum-

circumcision is not, unlesse he held circumcision to be as much a Gospell-Rite as any other, since it is against common sense, to say that which is greater is not available to such or such an end, because that which is lesse is not; and yet more irrationall would it be, to assert the non-availableness of that which is, from the non-availableness of that which is not, which yet would be the trip of the *Querist*, if he should not hold that circumcision had some manner of institutive being, yea and as eminent a being under the Gospell, as any other Rite of the Gospell hath.

But if it be the judgment of the *Querist* indeed, that circumcision is put by the Apostle as a *Synecdoche Speciei* of Gospell-Rites, *i.e.* of the same kind with them, and as a part of them, then why does he not practise it as such? or if he judge it to be none of them, then why does he make it a *Synecdoche Speciei of them*? or why does he estimate all Gospell-Rites and Ceremonies by that, and by what is said by the Apostle concerning that? I confesse I should as well as the *Querist* hold it an unreasonable thing for any baptized believer to disclaime Church-communion with those that are unbaptized, only because unbaptized; if I deemed a mans being unbaptized of no worse consequence then his being not circumcised. Truly I cannot but think that cause hard-belted, that is fain to beg its bread out of such desolate places, as is that of circumcision for one, whose foundation was long since rased by the hand of the Gospell to the very ground.

4. And lastly, but why also does the *Querist* oppose the Rites and Ceremonies of the Gospell, or under the Gospell, to the keeping of the Commandements of God? or does not he do so? who makes the observation of the Rites or Ceremonies of the Gospell to avail nothing towards the commending of a man to God, and yet withall, does make the keeping of the Commandements of God, as proceeding from Faith available hereunto, which constructively, clearly supposes the Rites and Ceremonies of the Gospell to be none of the Commandements of God. That the *Querist* makes the keeping of the Commandements of God, as proceeding from Faith, available as to a mans acceptation with God, in that very sense in which he

he had utterly denied the observation of Gospell-Rites and Ceremonies to be available, appears plainly in these words of his, viz. *But that which was all in all unto men, and which availed any thing in and under the Gospell, that which being found in men rendred them accepted and approved with God, and the want of it disapproved, was such a kind of Faith (not such or such a kind of ceremony, or such or such a kind of baptisme) which by the mediation or intervening of that heavenly affection of love, uttereth and expresseth it self, in keeping the Commandements of God*; so that the Rites and Ceremonies of the Gospell (baptism being there named for one) according to the tenor of this writing, must be none of the Commandements of God; (which yet I dare say is none of his opinion) or els the keeping of them, as produced by Faith and love, must be available to a mans acceptation with God, as well as the keeping of any other his commands, which yet to say, and it is the truth, doth utterly contradict what was said before, in denying the observation of the ceremonies of the Gospell to be available unto any such purpose.

III. Query.

Whether can it be proved by any text or passage of Scripture, either directly, or by any tolerable consequence, that Christian Churches were in the Apostles days constituted by baptism, or that none were reputed members of Churches, or admitted into Christian communion with those who were baptized, but only such who were baptized likewise?

Respon.

It hath been already proved (as I conceive) in the answer to the first query, by some *text or passage of Scripture, either directly, or by some tolerable consequence*, or rather both directly, and also by clear and pregnant consequence, that Christian Churches were in the Apostles daies constituted, if not by baptism, yet not without baptism, and consequently that none were admitted into Church-fellowship but such as were baptized; and therefore having proved this already, it is not necessary to prove it here again: But because such a thing as this, is not so barren of proof in the eyes of those that plead it, as the *Querist* seems to suppose in those words following, where he says, that

that that text *Acts* 2.41. *is commonly, and only ſo far as he knows, pretended for proof of ſuch a thing*; I ſhall briefly point to ſeverall other texts, by which it will appear, that the Churches in the Apoſtles daies, were not conſtituted without baptiſm.

That the Church of *Rome* was baptized, and therefore not conſtituted without baptiſm, appears *Rom.* 6. And ſo the Church of *Corinth*: the firſt beginning of that Church, ſo far as we read of its beginning, was laid in baptiſm, *Acts* 18.8. 1 *Cor.* 1.13.14. 15.16. & 12.13. So the Churches of *Galatia*, *Gal.* 3.27. the Church of *Epheſus*, *Acts* 19.1.5. was ſurely begun by thoſe twelve Diſciples whom *Paul* baptized, or ſome that were with him. So alſo the firſt foundation of the Church at *Philippi*, was laid in baptiſm; for *Lydia* and her houſhold, the Goaler and his houſhold, as you will perceive by that part of hiſtory, *Acts* 16. from *ver.* 12. to 34. who were the firſt fruits of the Goſpell there, were baptized. The like may be ſaid of the Church of *Coloſſe*, *chap.* 2. *ver.* 12. and ſo of the *Hebrews*, *Heb.* 6. 1. 2. *Acts* 2. 41. and therefore ſurely the *Queriſt* did not need to challenge us upon tolerable conſequence, to make proof that Chriſtian Churches were conſtituted by baptiſm, or by baptized perſons, in the Apoſtles daies, nor yet to preſume, that *Acts* 2. 41. was all the Scriptures that could be pretended to prove ſuch a thing.

The *Queriſt* therefore ſuppoſing all our ſtrength for this cauſe, to be in that one Scripture of *Acts* 2. 41. he tryes ſundry wayes (I will not ſay, as *Dalilah* did with *Sampſon*) to bereave us of this our ſtrength, as follows.

Querift.

Conſidering that that Text Acts 2. 41. (*commonly, and only, ſo far as I know, pretended for proof of ſuch a thing*) *doth not ſo much as colour, much leſſe cotten with ſuch a ſuppoſall or concluſion*, viz. That Chriſtian Churches were conſtituted by baptiſm in the Apoſtles daies, *the tenor of the place being only this, then they that gladly received his word, were baptized, and the ſame day there were added unto them about three thouſand ſoules.*

Reſpon.

However this text doth not now ſeem to the *Querift*, either to colour or to cotten with the concluſion now oppoſed by him;

him; yet let me make bold to remember him, (becauſe I judge his firſt thoughts his beſt thoughts, as unto this) that it is not many years ſince it did cotten well enough with the foreſaid concluſion, in the judgment and apprehenſion even of the *Queriſt* himſelf, who in an Epiſtle to a friend, (a copy whereof I obtained) had this ſaying upon this very text, viz. 'Evi-'dent it is, that thoſe that were added to the Church were 'baptized before this was affirmed of them (*viz.* that they 'were added) now being baptized, and that in an orderly and 'right way, (as ye will not deny) this did immediately quali-'fie them for Church-fellowſhip, according to your owne 'grounds, and the truth it ſelf. And again a little after, ſpeak-ing of a Church-covenant, he thus ſaith; 'That it is not law-'full before baptiſm is evident, becauſe it is not lawfull for a 'church to receive the unbaptized into fellowſhip with them, 'as members of their body, neither is there appearance, exam-'ple, or warrant in the Scripture for ſuch a thing.

But it may be the *Queriſt* upon ſecond thoughts hath found cauſe to alter his former opinion hereabout, (and a man may at any time with honor change for the better) and therefore let us weigh and conſider his reaſons, why he is of another mind now, which he delivers, as follows.

Queriſt.

For 1. *It is not here ſaid*, That all they that gladly received the Word, were baptized, *but indefinitely only*, they that gladly received, &c. *Now indefinite expreſſions in Scripture, are not al-ways equipolent to Univerſalls, but ſometimes to partitives or par-ticulars.*

Reſpon.

1. Though indefinite expreſſions are not alwayes equipo-lent to Univerſalls, yet many times they are, as the *Queriſt* doth tacitly grant, in ſaying only, that they are not alwayes e-quipolent, implying, that many times they are, which indeed is a truth obvious in theſe Scriptures (and as I conceive hundreds more) *Mat.* 20. 13. *Mark* 2. 17. & 8. 9. *Joh.* 5. 25. 29. & 17. 21. 23. 24. *Rom.* 8. 8. & 11. 23. 1 *Cor.* 7. 29. 30. 31. & 15. 18. 48. *Gal.* 3. 7. 9. & 5. 21. and therefore it in no wiſe follows, that becauſe ſuch an indefinite expreſſion as is here uſed, is not alwayes of an u-niverſall

niverſall import, or ſignification, that therefore it is not ſo here.

But 2. The coherence of the words conſidered, it cannot reaſonably be otherwiſe conceived, but that *they*, is all *they, that gladly received the word were baptized*: For the Apoſtles exhortation and counſell to the whole multitude was, that they would repent and be baptized EVERY one of them for remiſſion of ſins, *ver.* 38. and therefore if their receiving his Word gladly, import nothing els but their believing, imbracing, and willingly obeying his Word, (as I ſuppoſe nothing leſſe is hereby meant) then it is impoſſible reaſonably to conceive, but that every one of thoſe who gladly received his Word were alſo baptized, becauſe that word which they did receive enjoyned them ſo to be; and for them not to have been baptized, as the caſe then ſtood, they would have been ſo far from receiving his word gladly, as that it muſt have been ſaid of them, inſtead of that which is ſaid, as it was ſaid of the Phariſees and Lawyers, *That they rejected the counſell of God againſt themſelves, and were not baptized, Luk.* 7. 30.

Queriſt.

2. *Whether is it here ſaid, nor is it a thing in it ſelf much probable, that ONLY they who were baptized, were added unto them, (i. e. to the pre-exiſtent number of Diſciples) but onely and ſimply, that there were the number of three thouſand added the ſame, day.*

Reſpon.

1. It is to be noted, that the *Queriſt* ſayes only thus much; that it is not much probable &c. it ſhould ſeem then in his opinion, it was ſomewhat probable, though not much, that only they that were baptized were added to the church; and if it be ſomething probable, though not much in his opinion, whoſe endeavour it is to render it improbable, I believe it will be found much probable in their thoughts, that ſhall be indifferent Judges of the caſe.

For 2 Of whom does *Luke* here ſpeak, when he ſaid, that the ſame day there added unto them about three thouſand ſoules: Have we any reaſon in the world to imagine that he intends any other perſons then thoſe of whom he is ſpeaking, to wit, thoſe that gladly received the Word, and were baptized?

For what occasion is here ministred to any mans thoughts, by any thing mentioned in or about the text, to pitch upon any other then those very persons, the mention of whom doth next and immediately precede the words in question? and which looks like the most genuine and least strained sense, either to say, *Then they that gladly received his word were baptized, and the same day there was added* [of them] *about* 3000. *souls*, or to say, there was added of them, and some others (of whom yet there is no mention made) about three thousand souls? But it seemes we must expect to have nothing granted, though never so probable, that favours our cause, unlesse every word and tittle amount to the evidence of a demonstration: It were well indeed if our friends would themselves walk by the same rule, and give to us the same measure they require of us.

But I pray, who, or what should they be, besides those that gladly received the word, and were baptized, that you suppose were added to the church?

Querist.

Within which number, viz. of 3000. *it is the probable opinion of some, that the children and families of those, who are said to have gladly received the word, are comprehended, it being no wayes likely, scarce possible, that* 3000. *men should distinctly hear the voice of a man speaking, especially unlesse we should suppose, that those* 3000. *stood nearest unto him that spake, and with best advantage to hear, there being many thousands more present, which can hardly be the supposition of any considering man in the case in hand.*

Respon.

Not to take much notice how far the probable opinion of some will be accepted for proof against us, when nothing but demonstrations will be accepted on our behalf, I shall first demand of the *Querist*, that if the children and families of those that gladly received the word, and were baptized, were indeed part of that number of 3000. that were added to the church; or to the Disciples, (as he sayes it is the probable opinion of some that they were) then I demand, I say, whether these children and families were baptized or no? If he shall say they were not, then he puts to rebuke another of his opinions, which

which is, that when believers themselves were baptized, their children were baptized also; to the belief of which he would perswade us, at least as probable, in his 24. Quære from *Acts* 16. 15. 33. 1 *Cor.* 1. 16. If he say they were baptized, why then, though it should be granted that these were some of the number, yet how would this prove, that others besides those that were baptized were added to the church, which yet is the thing he was to prove?

But then 2. to put the matter quite out of doubt, that none of the children of those that gladly received the word, were part of the 3000. that were added to the church, (if by children, he mean little children, or infants; for els if they were *adult* ones, they might gladly receive the word, and be baptized as well as their parents) it sufficiently appeares, in that it is said, *They* (i.e. they that were added, as well as they to whom they were added) *continued stedfastly in the Apostles Doctrine, and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayer*: and I presume the *Querist* will not say, that little children, infants, did continue stedfastly in the Apostles doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread and prayers; and if not, then they were none of the number of the 3000. that were added to the church: and so I think by this time the probable opinion of some in this behalf, is rendred more then probably, to be a weak, groundlesse, and erroneous opinion.

3. To remove that doubt touching the improbability, that 3000. men should distinctly hear the voice of a man speaking, unlesse we will suppose them to stand neerest to him that spake. 1. Evident it is, that they did hear, and so hear, as to receive the word gladly, but whether they were neerest to him that spake or no, is more then he or I can tell, or need to know. But 2. There is no necessity to suppose that all the whole 3000. did all of them heare and convert in the self-same hour or juncture of time; for one while the Apostle might preach to one company of them, and another while to another company, and yet this would not hinder, but that they might all be converted, baptized, and added to the church the self-same day.

3. Neither do I see any necessity to hold, that all these 3000.

that were in one day converted, baptized, and added to the church, were thus converted and baptized by *Peter* only, but by him and the rest of the Apostles, or by them and the other Disciples also. For 1. it is said, that *Peter standing up with the eleven, lift up his voice, and said unto them, &c.* and doth not this imploy, that the eleven did take part with him, and assist him in the work? 2. These men of Israel being pricked at their hearts, they do not cry out to *Peter* only, but the text saith, *They said to* Peter, *and the rest of the Apostles, men and brethren, what shall we do*, ver. 37. and therefore it should seem, the rest of the Apostles, as well as *Peter*, had ministered occasion to them of this demand. Nay 3. which is yet more, its said ver. 4. *that they all* (to wit the whole number of Disciples that were present together, being filled with the Holy Ghost) *began to speak with tongues, as the spirit gave them utterance*; which certainly was to the understanding of the multitude, and also about such things as did much affect them, for its said, *the multitude were confounded at it, and marvelled, saying, we do hear them speak in our own tongues, the wonderfull works of God*, ver. 6. 7. 8. 11. All which things considered, I think it will not be irrationall to suppose, that others besides *Peter* might be instrumentall in the conversion of those 3000.

Querist.

Nor 2. is it said, or so much as intimated or hinted in the least, that any of the whole number of the 3000. *who were added unto them, were added by means, or upon the account of their being baptized, although this addition be not mentioned till after their baptizing. It is ten degrees more probable, that their believing or Discipleship, which were precedent to their baptizing, and not their being baptized, were the reason and ground of* Lukes *saying, they were added to the Church; considering first, that the originall, main and principal foundation of the holy brotherhood amongst the Saints, is not the ceremony of their baptism, but their fellowship and communion in the divine nature, and inward relation to the same Christ, by one and the same pretious faith.*

Respon.

We do not affirm, that they were added to that particular church by baptism immediately, without any other act intervening

vening; but we say, they were not added without baptisme, and so much is in effect acknowledged by the Querist himself, in that he sayes, this addition is not mentioned till after their being baptized, and therefore their baptism must needs go before their addition to the church, unlesse we will suppose *Luke* to have begun at the wrong end of this part of his Narrative, in mentioning that first, which was last done, and that last, which was first done, and if so, then according to the order of things done, they were first added to the church, and then afterward did gladly receive the word to conversion, and were baptized, which I suppose no man is so void of common sense as to believe.

And if their baptisme did precede their addition to the church, then why does the Querist strive so as he does, to intersse their believing or Discipleship, with exclusion of their baptism, as the reason and ground of *Lukes* saying, they were added to the church? For if he does not exclude baptisme in recounting the reason of that addition, then we are agreed; for there is no question, but that their gladly receiving the Word, or believing the Word, or becoming Disciples by the Word, was one reason or ground of their addition to the church, bnt not the only one, for *Luke* mentions their being baptized, as well as that; and why should any man go about to seperate them? The question is not, whether faith or baptisme is the originall, main, and principall ground of the holy brother-hood amongst the Saints, as he calls it; we willingly grant, (and therefore could have spared him the labour of proving) that faith hath the precedency herein: But what will it therefore follow, that becaufe believing is the originall and principall ground of the holy brother-hood, or church-relation, that therefore baptism is none at all? does he not know, that though the Apostle gives repentance from dead works, and faith towards God, the first place in the foundation, yet he assigns baptism its place, and standing next to them in the same foundation, *Heb.* 6. 1. 2.

Querist.

2. *That it cannot be demonstratively proved from the Scriptures that those hundred and twenty Disciples*, Acts 1. 15. *unto which is*

is

it here ſaid, that 3000. were added, were or had been all of them baptized; nor can it any whit more be proved, that the Apoſtles themſelves mentioned Acts 1. 13. had been baptized, then that John *the Baptiſt was baptized.*

Reſpon.

1: Suppoſe the Scripture no where mentions where, when, or by whom thoſe 120. Diſciples were baptized, is this any good reaſon to conclude therefore, that they were not baptized at all, or will the Queriſt think, that becauſe we do not (as to the beſt of my memory we do not) read in Scripture of the baptizing of the Church of *Smyrna*, *Pergamos*, *Thyatira*, *Sardis*, *Philadelphia*, and *Laodicea*, that therefore none of theſe Churches were baptized? or becauſe we read onely of the baptiſm of 3000. of the Church at *Jeruſalem*, that therefore all the reſt, when that Church encreaſed to the number of 5000. *Acts* 4. 4. yea to many thouſands *Acts* 21. 20. were unbaptized? Is it not enough that the Commiſſion was to baptize all of all Nations, who were firſt made Diſciples by teaching, *Mat.* 28. 19. and that we have frequent mention in the Scriptures, of the Apoſtles and other Diſciples, their walking and acting according to this Commiſſion; I ſay, is not this enough to cauſe us to conclude, that all thoſe that were Diſciples indeed, and knew it to be their duty to be baptized, were baptized accordingly, unleſſe we will be ſo uncharitable towards them, as to conceive them guilty of living in the breach of one of the known precepts of the Goſpell: Neither can we reaſonably imagine any of them to be ignorant of this, *viz.* that ſubmitting to baptiſm was their duty, inaſmuch as this was one of the firſt things they were directed to do, in order to their becoming Chriſtians, *Acts* 2.38. & 8.12. & 16.33. & 22.16.

2. It ſhould ſeeme that theſe 120. Diſciples had continued with Chriſt, and kept company with the Apoſtles, *all the times that Jeſus went in and out among them, beginning from the baptiſm of* John, *unto that ſame day, in which he was taken up from among them*, as we have it, *Acts* 1. 21. 22. and if ſo, is not their being baptized ſufficiently ſignified, where it is ſaid of Chriſt, that he baptized, and all men came to him, *John* 3. 26. 22. unleſſe we will ſuppoſe, that he cauſed others to be baptized that did

did not follow him, and did excuſe thoſe that did?

3. As for the Apoſtles themſelves, who were mentioned *Acts* 1. 13. to ſuppoſe them not to be baptized, is to ſuppoſe them to be Phariſee-like, who as our Saviour ſayes, *did bind heavy burdens, and grievous to be born, and lay them on mens ſhoulders, when they themſelves would not touch them with one of their fingers*: for we ſee they impoſed baptiſme as a duty upon other men, *Acts* 2. 38. and therefore how can we think ſo evill of them, as not to conceive that they had begun to them in the ſame way themſelves, or if they had not, might not that multitude at Jeruſalem, upon whom they urged it as their duty, have ſaid unto them, *Phyſitians heal your ſelves*? or was it any leſſe the duty of ſuch men, who became Apoſtles, then of other men? ſince we find *Paul* that great Apoſtle preſſed to it by direction from Chriſt Jeſus, before he was to act as an Apoſtle, *Acts* 22. 10. compared with *ver.* 16.

4. Suppoſe the Apoſtles had had no more oportunity of being baptized, then *John Baptiſt* had (which yet cannot reaſonably be ſuppoſed, nor is it certaine that *John* himſelfe was not baptized, ſince he ſaid to Chriſt, *I have need to be baptized of thee*, *Mat.* 3 14.) yet what is this to an ordinary caſe, or how would this excuſe them of baptiſm in order to Church fellowſhip, who want no ſuch oportunity.

Queriſt.

3. (And laſtly) *That had the Church, or perſons, to whom theſe* 3000. *are ſaid to have been added, been eſtimated by their having been baptized, (which muſt be ſuppoſed, if thoſe who are added to them, are ſaid to have beene added upon account of their being baptized) their number muſt needs have far exceeded an hundred and twenty, conſidering the great numbers, and vaſt multitudes of perſons that had beene baptized by* John, Matth. 3. 5. 6. *compared with* Mark 1. 5. Luke 3. 7. 21. *as alſo by Chriſt himſelf, and his Diſciples*, John 3. 22. 26. *yea, had the Church been eſtimated, or conſtituted by baptiſm, the Evangeliſt* Luke, *intending (queſtionleſſe* Acts 4. 4.) *to report the encreaſe of the Church, and progreſſe of the Goſpell, with as much advantage as truth would afford, had previ-*

ated

eated with the cause which he intended to promote, in reporting their number to have been about 5000. only, whereas upon the said supposition and tenor of the late premises, he might with as much truth have reported them about 40000. yea and many more.

Respon.

All that is argued by the Queriſt in this particular, is built upon a wrong ground, or rather upon a ſuppoſed ground, which is indeed ſuppoſed by him to be held by us, but is not; and that is, that the Diſciples or Church, were in reſpect of their number, eſtimated by their being baptized, that is, only by their being baptized, for if he do not mean ſo, he could not ſuppoſe that *Luke* might have reported the number of Diſciples to be forty thouſand, inſtead of that he does report them to be, upon ſuch an account. But the truth is, we do not eſtimate the Church or number of Diſciples, only by their being baptized, but by their being baptized in conjunction with their profeſſed believing in, and owning of Jeſus Chriſt crucified, and riſen again, as the Son of God, and Saviour of the world. And accordingly the 3000. that are ſaid to be added to the Church, *Acts* 2. are deſcribed, not by their baptiſme only, but by their gladly receiving the Word, and their being baptized too, *ver.* 41. and what word was it that they did gladly receive and believe, but (together with others) that word of the Apoſtle, by which he declared Jeſus whom they had crucified, to have beene raiſed from the dead, and to have beene made both Lord and Chriſt, *ver.* 24. 32. 33.

Both theſe qualifications then being requiſite to denominate perſons of the number of the Church, *Luke* could not have duly eſtimated the number of Diſciples, or of the Church onely by that baptiſm which perſons had received before Chriſt was crucified (though its true alſo on the other ſide, that neither could he truly eſtimate them to be of that number without any baptiſm at all) becauſe the greateſt part of thoſe that were baptized by *John*, into the expectation of Chriſt to come, yet did not believe in him, or own him as the Chriſt of God when he was come, much leſſe they, and many who had beene baptized by the Diſciples of Chriſt, did believe in him, his being crucified notwithſtanding; * ſo that all the account that *Luke* could

* *Luke* had no reaſon to number them with the Church, though baptized, who had fallen from the Faith into which they were baptized, and conſequently had denied their baptiſm it ſelf.

could truly give of the number of the Church, or of Disciples, was only of such baptized persons, who after the death and Resurrection of Christ, did believe in him, which it seemes amounted to no more then about an hundred and twenty.

And as for those who had beene baptized by *John* into the expectation of Christ to come, and yet did not own him when he was come; or els if they did believe in him for a season, yet did afterward renounce him, either before, or upon his being crucified; these were so far from being reputed of the number of the Gospell-church, upon account of their baptism received formerly, either from *John*, or Christ, as that they were directed and exhorted by the Apostle, as well to be baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus, as to repent for the remission of sin, before they could be admitted into the Church, or be counted of its number, their former baptism notwithstanding, *Act.* 2. 38 41. For who can imagine, but that if not all, yet that many of the 3000. that were baptized upon the preaching of *Peter* and the rest, had been baptized before by *John*; or who can conceive, but that if not all, yet that many, at the least, of that great multitude unto whom the Apostle preached at that time when the 3000. were converted, had beene baptized by *John*, those Scriptures considered, cited by the Querist, *Mat.* 3. 5. 6. *Mark* 1. 5. *Luke* 3. 7. 21. where it is said, *that all the Land of* Judea, *and they of* Jerusalem, *were ALL baptized.* And again, *that ALL the people were baptized*; and yet the Apostles exhortation to these inhabitants of Jerusalem, that were now gathered together to the number of many thousands, was, that they *would repent and be baptized EVERY ONE* of them, and as many as did receive this word, were baptized accordingly, and so added to the church.

Since then the owning of Christ crucified, together with a being baptized in his name, was requisite to render men of the number of Disciples, as a Church: Hence it came to passe, that *Luke* could not estimate their number to be more then 120. *Act.* 1. 1. 15. not above about 5000. *Act.* 4. 4. notwithstanding more had been baptized by *John*, unlesse more of them had adhered to Christ crucified, as these did; so then, though baptism be one of the requisites, not without which, yet it is not

the only requisite, by which the number of the church is to be estimated. By this time therefore I hope it doth appeare, that this *Acts* 2. 41. doth both colour and cotten (to use the Querists own words) with the supposal or conclusion, *viz.* that churches, or at least the first Gospell-church, (a Sampler to the rest) was not constituted without baptism, notwithstanding all that by the Querist hath been offered to the contrary.

And if the first church or churches might not be constituted without baptism, then neither may those that succeed them, because the same reasons that made baptism necessary hereunto with them, makes it necessary also unto us; for Gospell-order, setled by Apostolicall authority and direction, as this was, hath not lost any of its native worth, efficacy, or obliging vertue, by disuse and discontinuance, upon occasion of the Papall defection, but ought to be the same to us now, who are studious of a thorough reformation, as it was unto them in the first beginning of such order, or rather according to *Davids* resolution upon a like occasion (*Psal.* 119. 126. 127. 128.) to be the more closely adhered to, and the vindication and observation of such Gospell-rules to be managed with so much the more zeal, after the example of Christ himself, who as well as the Psalmist, *was even eaten up with the zeal of his fathers house*, John 2. 16. 17. when he found corruption crept into it.

IV. Quære.

Whether did not the Church at Rome, *in the Apostles daies, and so also the Church in* Galatia, *hold Church communion with some who were not baptized, considering* 1. *That the Apostle to the former writeth thus*; Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death? *Rom.* 6. 3. *and to the later* (*after the same manner*) *thus*; For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, Gal. 3. 27. 2. *That this Particle* as many as (*used in both places*) *is in such constructions as these, always partitive, distinguishing or dividing the entire number of persons spoken of, some from others by the character or property specified, or at least supposeth a possibility of such a distinction.*

Respon.

1. I cannot grant the Querist his assertion, *viz.* that this particle

ticle *as many as*, is in such constructions as these alwayes partitive, though I grant that many times it is; for when the Apostle saith, 1 *Tim.* 6. 1. *Let as many servants as are under the yoke, count their own Masters worthy of all honor*; doth he thereby suppose or imply, that there were some servants, who were not under the yoke, or that there were some servants, who were not to count their owne Masters worthy of all honour? both which must be supposed notwithstanding, if this form or manner of speaking, *as many as*, be alwayes to be understood partitively, or as dividing the entire number of persons spoken of, which yet to suppose, who sees not how absurd it would be?

Objct. If it be said, this exhortation, *Let as many servants as, &c.* doth intentionally respect so many believing servants as were under the yoke, and that therefore in respect of other servants, who were not believers, it is partitive.

Answ. If so, then the answer is, that so do those expressions used *Rom.* 6. 3. *Gal.* 3. 27. intentionally only respect those at *Rome*, and in *Galatia*, who did believe, and were baptized, and therefore is partitive, in respect of others the Inhabitants of those places, dividing those of these churches, from others dwelling in the same places, who were not of these churches; so that if that objected should be granted, yet we shall gaine as much or more by it one way, then we shall lose by it in the other.

2. The coherence consulted, will evince the expressions *so many of us as, and as many as*, to comprehend all those persons of whom those churches did consist: For consider unto whom does the Apostle speak, *Rom.* 6. 3. does he not speak to the whole church, and every individuall soul of them, in the 1. 2. ver. When he sayes, *What shall we say then? shall we continue in sin that grace may abound? God forbid: How shall we that are dead to sin, live any longer therein?* And if these words in the 1. 2. ver. respect the whole church, as they must be supposed to do, unlesse you will suppose that the Apostle did grant a liberty to some of the church to continue in sin, and to live therein; then those words in ver. 3. *Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death?* are interrogatively

rogatively propounded, not only to the same persons unto which the former words relate, but also as an argument or reason why none of them should live any longer in sin, which is the thing from which he was dissuading, not onely some of them, but even all of them, in the foregoing words, and which he improves in an argumentative way, throughout the greatest part of the chapter. And it would not befit the wisdome of any ordinary man, much lesse of a great Apostle, to make choice of a reason or motive to inforce his exhortation or perswasion, which is of lesse extent in the tendency and concernment of it, then are the persons which he does exhort, or dehort, which yet is a piece of weaknesse, of which you must suppose this Apostle to be here guilty, unlesse you do conclude, that all those of the church at *Rome* were dissuaded from continuing any longer in sin, upon this ground, because that they had all been baptized into the death of Christ, *viz.* a conformity to his death, as well as a beliefe of it: In a word, if the whole church had not been under the motive, the whole church could not be pressed by it, as here you see they are.

And for that other place *Gal.* 3. 27. the Apostle in ver. 26. had asserted them, *viz.* those to whom he now writes, *To be all the children of God by Faith in Christ Jesus*, i. e. were now looked upon as children of God, by their confessing and owning of Christ Jesus, of which he gives this account, *ver.* 27. because they had put on Christ in baptism; *ye are all the children of God by Faith in Christ Jesus*; for, or because as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ; as if he should say, if the owning & professing of Christ, does denominate men to be the children of God now under the Gospell, as indeed it does, then ye are all the children of God, because by being baptized into Christ, ye have all of you put him on, that is so, as to appear with him where ever you become, as you do appear with the cloaths you wear. But now most certain it is, that they could not all of them have been denominated the children of God by faith in Christ, upon account of their being baptized into Christ, which yet we see they are, unlesse they had been all of them baptized into Christ indeed.

Besides, doth it not appear in the return that is made to the first

firſt and third Quæries, that in the Apoſtles daies none were inchurched without baptiſm; and if ſo, then theſe places cannot import the contrary.

V. Query.

Whether did not the Church at Corinth, *in the Apoſtles daies, entertain members, and hold communion with thoſe who had not been baptized, conſidering that he demandeth thus of this Church, els what ſhall they do which are baptized for the dead, if the dead riſe not at all? why are they then baptized for the dead?* 1 Cor. 15. 29. *Or doth not this imply, that there was a corrupt and ſuperſtitious practiſe on foot in this Church, to baptize one or other of the ſurviving kindred or friends, in the name of ſuch perſons reſpectively, who died unbaptized, and if ſo, is it not a plain caſe, that there were ſome of theſe members, who lived and died unbaptized?*

Reſpon.

1. Though it ſhould be granted (which may not) that there was ſuch a ſuperſtitious thing practiſed, by ſome of that church, in the behalf of ſome of their friends, who died unbaptized, yet it is not neceſſary at all to ſuppoſe thoſe dead friends of theirs to have been of the church whileſt they were alive, but much more probable it would be, (if the practiſe it ſelfe were probable) that the dead, in behalf of whom ſuch a thing was performed, were of the *Catechumeni*, or others, who were not of the church, but ſuch, who though they were under ſome Nurture, and in a way of learning ſomewhat of the Goſpell, yet died before they were either baptized, or admitted as Members of the Church?

But 2. It is but a meer conjecture (and as will be found, not only without ground, but againſt reaſon) that the Apoſtle in the forecited words, ſhould have reſpect unto ſuch a ſuperſtitious practiſe, as that ſpecified.

For 1. Its no ways probable, that *Paul* would argue this great Article of the Goſpel, the Reſurrection, from a ſuperſtitious cuſtome, or would draw ſuch a clean thing, out of that which was ſo unclean.

2. Much leſſe is it probable, that he ſhould do ſo without taxing them by way of reproof for it; for might not they have been very apt to have concluded the Apoſtles approbation of their

their practise, should he have produced it as usefull to convince them of the doctrine of the Resurrection, without declaring his dislike of it? 3. *Pauls* interrogatory indefinitely propounded to the whole church, supposes them all to have been baptized, 1 *Cor.*1.13. *were ye baptized in the name of Paul?* and that saying of his does assert it, 1 *Cor.*12.13. *we are all baptized into one body.*

3. Is it not far more probable, and more agreeable to other Scriptures, and with the coherence of the Text, to suppose: 1. That the Apostle should herein mind them of their baptism in water, wherein the Resurrection is figuratively represented, (*Rom.*6.4.5. *Col.*2.12.) and by which when they first received the Gospel, they made profession of their Faith, touching the Resurrection. Or els 2. That hereby is intended the baptism of afflictions, (elsewhere mentioned, *Mat.* 20. 22. *Luk.* 12. 50.) considering that the Apostle immediately subjoyns the mention of his own and others hazzards and sufferings, saying, *And why stand we in jeopardy? I protest by your rejoycing which I have in Christ Iesus, I die daily: if after the manner of men, I have fought with beasts at* Ephesus; *what advantageth it me, if the dead rise not? let us eat and drink, to morrow we shall die, ver.* 30. 31. 32. as if he should say, why have ye suffered trouble and persecution for the Gospell (which is a kind of death, for he here says of himself, that he died daily, meaning his sufferings) if ye do not believe the Resurrection? and why do we stand yet in further jeopardy? nay then rather let us eat and drink, for to morrow we shall die.

These interpretations surely carry a far greater probability to answer the drift of the Apostle, then that given by the Quæriſt: But surely there is little edification or satisfaction, when only one doubtfull thing is brought to prove another, or rather when one improbable thing must serve instead of a proof, to make that seem probable, which of it self is altogether improbable: But is not that cause barren of proofes, and destitute of friends, that must be beholding to such strangers to stand by it, and succour it?

VI. Query.

Whether when Paul *soon after his conversion, assayed to joyn to the*

the Church and Diſciples at Jeruſalem, (Act. 9. 26.) *did this Church make any enquiry after his baptiſm, as whether he had been baptized or no, in order to his reception among them; or did they know he had been baptized? or did* Barnabas *in giving ſatisfaction to the Apoſtles and Church, concerning his meetneſſe to be admitted into communion with them, ſo much as mention his being baptized, but only* declared unto them, how he had ſeene the Lord in the way, and that he had ſpoken to him, and how he had preached boldly at *Damaſcus* in the name of Jeſus, *Act.* 9. 27.

Reſpon.

1. We have no good reaſon to ſuppoſe, much leſſe conclude, that *Paul* was admitted to communion with the church, untill the church had knowledge, either from himſelf, *Barnabas*, or ſome other, of his having obeyed the Goſpell, in imbracing the firſt principles of it, of which baptiſm is one; for how ſhould they know him to be a Diſciple of Chriſt, and ſo meet for communion with them, but by knowing that he had at leaſt done the firſt things of a Diſciple, of which we find all along this hiſtory of the *Acts* of the Apoſtles, a being baptized to be one; and doubtleſſe leſſe ſatisfaction would not ſerve them concerning him, then would concerning another Diſciple, who had never appeared in that height of oppoſition againſt them, as he had done.

2. When *Barnabas* declared to them, how he had ſeene the Lord in the *way*, and had ſpoken to him, did he not declare what it was that the Lord ſpake to him? if ſo, then how can it be thought, but that the relation of his being baptized muſt come in at the one end of his report, inaſmuch as that direction which the Lord gave *Saul*, about his going into ſtraight ſtreet, in order to his further information touching the will of the Lord concerning him, led him to rehearſe the carriage of *Ananias* towards *Saul*, and conſequently his baptizing of him, unleſſe you will ſuppoſe *Barnabas* to have made a broken and imperfect relation of the Lords dealing with him, which you cannot lightly do, without ſuppoſing *Barnabas*, either weak, or careleſſe in the buſineſſe. But ſurely the Querift does not think that *Barnabas* uſed no more words in his relation, then what are here recorded by *Luke*, ſince we have frequent-

ly

ly, if not for the moſt part, but the briefe heads of things recorded, that were done and ſpoken by Chriſt, the Apoſtles, and other Diſciples, *John* 21. 25. *Acts* 2. 40.

3. Might not the Quæriſt with as much reaſon have quæried, whether the church (upon *Pauls* aſſaying to joyn with them) did make any enquiry at all, whether he were converted to the faith or no, as whether he was baptized or no; for indeed here is no expreſſe mention made of the churches enquiring after the one, any more then the other, only its ſaid, *They were afraid of him, and believed not that he was a Diſciple.* But what, ſhall we therefore think, that the church did not at all enquire of theſe things concerning him, in order to their receiving of him into communion with them?

4. We do not find here, that *Paul* himſelf ſpake any one word to them, when he aſſayed to joyn himſelf with them, only its ſaid, *That when* Saul *was come to* Jeruſalem, *he aſſayed to joyn himſelf to the Diſciples*: But what ſhall we therefore think that *Paul* made no relation to the Diſciples, of the Lords dealing with him, in order to their receiving of him? or if we will ſuppoſe he did, (as no one, I think, is ſo void of ſenſe, as to ſuppoſe otherwiſe) can we ſuppoſe leſſe, then that he ſhould declare to them, what the Lord had done for him by the Miniſtery of *Ananias*, and if ſo, his being baptized? eſpecially conſidering, that where we find *Paul* upon another occaſion, not greater then this, making the relation of that great providence of the Lord towards him in his converſion, he does particularly mention his baptiſm, *Acts* 22. 5. to 16. There being then ſo little in this Quære, as you ſee, I confeſſe I have not a little marvelled, to ſee ſome make ſo much of it as they have done.

The ſubſtance of the ſeventh Quære being only this, viz. *Whether many things may not lawfully be done, for which there is no example in Scripture, of like action in all circumſtances, and whether therefore it is not lawfull for baptized, to joyn with unbaptized perſons in Church-communion, though it ſhould be granted that it cannot be proved that ever they did ſo in the Apoſtles dayes.*

For anſwer to this, I ſhall refer to what is given in anſwer to the 1. Quære, this only I ſhal add, that many things may lawfully

be

be done, for which there is no example in Scripture of like action in all circumstances, yet it does not therefore follow, that such an action may be lawfull, which is contrary to such examples in Scripture, which are Recorded for our direction and imitation, which yet is the thing the Querist is to make good, before he is like to satisfie me in this particular, what ever he may doe to others.

QUERIE *VIII.*

Whether is an Action or Practice, suppose in matters relating to the Service or Worship of God, upon this account evicted to be unlawfull, because is hath neither Precept (I meane no particular or expresse Precept, wherein the Action or Practice is selfe, with all the Circumstances under which it becomes lawfull is named) or Example to justifie it?

Resp.

An action relating to the worship of God, is not to be concluded unlawfull, though it have no particular nor expresse precept or example in so many words, upon which to bottome it, if there be any generall rule which will safely warrant it, as there is for admitting women to the Table of the Lord, or for a Ministers preaching, though to young men only, from *Rev.* 22. 3. or 4. which are two of the Querists instances. But if such an action be not only void of particular precept or example, yea and of generall precept too, but is also contrary to, and a transgression of a generall rule and precept, and a swerving from particular example stampt with Divine approbation; then I hope it is not lawfull, but unlawfull, which yet cleerly is the case of Baptized persons holding communion with unbaptized, in as much as it crosses that holy order of the Gospell, commission of Christ, and constant practice of primitive beleevers, Recorded in Scripture for our learning, and which is to be observed and kept inviolably by all those servants of Christ, who are not willing to exchange Christs owne Order and Method, for that which is but of Man; and who are not willing to give way to Antichristian obtrusions, to justle out wayes sanctified by the Lord Jesus for the feet of his Saints. See more for this in the answer to Queries 1. and 3.

QUERIE XX.

Whether when God hath by Faith purified the hearts of a people walking in Christian brotherhood and fellowship together, hath he not Sanctified them? And in case any person shall now despise or decline their fellowship as unholy, doth he not sinne against that Heavenly admonition delivered by speciall Revelation unto Peter; What God hath cleansed (i. e. *Purified or Sanctified*) call not thou (*or make not them*) common? *Or can a man lightly call, or make that common, which God hath sanctified in a more opprobrious and contumelious way, then by flying from it as polluted or unholy?*

Act. 10. 15.

Respon:

If this Querie suppose that Baptized believers withdraw Communion from unbaptized beleevers, as judging them unholy, common or uncleane, as it must suppose, or else its nothing to the purpose, then there is a great mistake in the Querist. For I for my part, doe judge many persons who are not Baptized, Holy and cleane, and their hearts purified to a good degre, and yet I cannot but judge withall, that the way of holding Church-Communion with these, without their being Baptized, a common way (too common indeed) and such as God hath not Sanctified. And therefore the question is not touching the state and condition of their persons, God-ward in respect of justification, but of their way of holding Communion without Baptisme; and whether this be as well approved by God, as their persons are accepted with him upon their beleeving; if not, we may love and honour their persons, and yet dislike their way of Communion, without offence to God.

Communion with them then, is declined for their way-sake, because we cannot have Communion with their persons, in a Church-way * without having Communion with their way it self, which I must witnesse against, as that which God hath not sanctified by any word of his, that I know of. And therefore our declining Communion upon these termes, is not a calling, or a making of them, but their way Common or uncleane.

* Behold Israel after the flesh, are not they which eat of the Sacrifice, partakers of the Altar? &c. 1 Cor. 10. 18.

The

The 10. and 11. Queries importing much what the same thing, I shall make the same answer serve both.

X. and XI. Queries contracted.

Whether need a man contract guilt of sinne, by walking in a society of men Christian and holy, though they have some practice among them which he cannot approve of, in case he openly declare his dislike of it, and be not constrained to communicate in it? Or whether a difference in judgement, in or about a matter of doubtfull disputation, be a sufficient barre to Church-Communion?

Respon.

1. There is little question to be made, but that persons who are in and of a Church duly constituted, may continue their Communion there, notwithstanding there may be some opinion or practice among them of a doubtfull disputation; yea, though there be something among them which are certaine to them to be of an evil import, provided they faithfully witnesse against such evills: Nay surely it is not onely lawfull, but it is the duty of men in such cases to continue their Communion, that they that are stronger, might helpe the weaker, and be a meanes of purging the Church from that which doth defile.

But then 2. Though this be true, yet what is this to warrant a mans holding Communion with a company of believers, and acting with them as a Church, when he knowes they are no Church according to Gospell-rule? It is not a company of Stones and pieces of Timber lying on a heap together that make a House, till they are put in order, and into the forme of a building: nor can you properly and truly call that heap a House, till the Foundation be first laid, and then the superstructure set upon it. In like manner, neither are a company of Beleevers a Church, because they are a company of Beleevers, nor can they duly act as such, or be called or accounted such in a Gospell sense, and according to order thereof, (which is the rule by which we must judge) till they are built together in an orderly way, the Foundation first (which in primitive Churches was never laid without Baptisme) and the superstructure after. *Ye also as lively stones, are built (or be ye built) up*

a ſpiritual Houſe, 1 *Pet.* 2. 5. They were firſt lively ſtones, and then built up a ſpirituall houſe, they were not a ſpirituall houſe becauſe living ſtones, untill theſe living ſtones were built up: and can any man think that there was any one ſpirituall houſe in the New Teſtament, whoſe Foundation was laid without Baptiſme? If not, as it is moſt certaine he cannot reaſonably ſo think: then give me leave to think, that they build without their rule, and not according to the method of the wiſe Maſter-Buliders of the firſt Churches, who both lay Foundation, and put on the Top-Stone too, without Baptiſm.

For a man then to hold communion with a company of Believers, not in Goſpell order, and to act with them as if they were, and yet to witneſſe againſt ſuch practice of theirs too, what is it elſe, then for a man to *condemne himſelfe in that which he alloweth*, *Rom.* 14. 22. yea and to make *himſelfe a tranſgreſſor in building what he deſtroyes*? *Gal.* 2. 18. This errour then of non-baptiſme, being an errour, not of Believers in a Church, duly ſo called, but an errour againſt the way of their becomming a Church according to Goſpell forme; it is not a mans reproving this practice in them will juſtifie his holding communion with them as a Church, no more then a mans reproving a woman for living with himſelfe as his wife, becauſe not duly marryed to him, will priviledge him in that communion with her. If this be not ſo, I demand of the Queriſt, why he and others could not have held communion with perſons Epiſcopall and Presbyteriall in their judgements, if Believers, though in no ſuch Church-ſtate and order as he now judgeth neceſſary, if his declaring his diſlike of their neglect of that Order he now holds neceſſary, would have excuſed the matter?

QUERIE *XII.*

Whether did the Lord Chriſt, pointing to any River or Water, ſay, Upon this rock will I build my Church?

Reſpon.

I would alſo querie (ſince I know no reaſon why ſuch a Querie ſhould be put) why or for what cauſe the Queriſt ſhould make ſuch a Querie as this? and whether he did ever heare, or doth

doth expect ever to heare such a senseleſſe assertion from any the Baptists whom he thus interogates? or doth any thing they say amount to as much? if not, why should it be insinuated as if their opinion or practise held confederacy with such a piece of ridiculosity as this?

Queriſt.

Or is there the softest whisper, or gentlest breathing in Scripture, that a true Church of Christ cannot be constituted, no not of the soundest Believers in the World, unlesse they have been baptised after their believing, how or after what manner soever they have been baptised before?

Reſpon.

If Baptisme have been administred according to Gospel-rule to men who by profession appeared or seemed true Believers when they were baptised, though at the time of their baptizing they were not so indeed in the sight of God, it is not (so farre as I know) necessary to their being of a Church, to be baptised againe when they come truly to believe. But if persons before they did believe, have not been baptised at all, with any Baptism that will hold weight in the ballance of the Sanctuary, but only with such which essentially differs from Scripture-Baptisme, both in respect of the Subject, and externall forme of Administration, (as Infant-Baptisme doth) in which respects it is of no more validity then no Baptisme at all; then it is necessary that such persons should be baptised after or upon their believing, in order to their Union and Communion with the Church. And that this was the constant, and for ought appeares to the contrary, the universall practise of the Apostles and Primitive Believers, and that in pursuance of the commission of Christ (and therefore ought to be the resolved practice of Believers now, from which no pretences should turne them aside) is not only *whispered and gently breathed*, but loudly declared by many Scriptures, lifting up their voice together in this testimony, as you may see in my answer to the first and third Queries.

QUERIE *XIII.*

Whether is an errour or mistake about the adequate or appropriate Subject of Baptisme, of any worse consequence or greater danger,

then an errour or mistake about Melchisedech's *Father, as viz. in case a man should suppose him to have been* Noah, *when as he was some other man?*

Reason.

I would likewise demand of the Querist, whether there would be any more danger for a man to list Souldiers in the name of the Parliament of *England*, who hath no Commission so to doe, then there would be for him to mistake the name or person of a man, the knowledge of whom doth nothing at all concerne him? If there be, then I shall not doubt to affirme, that there is more danger for a man to invocate the name of Father, Sonne, and Holy Ghost, and in their name to say, I baptise thee such or such a one, when neither Father, Sonne, nor Holy Ghost have given him Commission so to doe, (which yet is the case (indeed the crime) of mistaking the true or right subject of Baptisme) then there is in mistaking the man that was *Melchisedechs* Father. For the one is a counterfeiting or feigning of a Commission from Heaven, and the fathering of an untruth upon, or the speaking of an untruth in the name of the Lord to provoke him to anger: and the other, *viz.* to suppose *Melchisedechs* Father to be *Noah*, in case he were some other man, would be an errour only of lesse import, as, *viz.* for a man to go about to *make himselfe wise above that which is written*, in a businesse that concernes him not to know, and wherein his ignorance would not prejudice him, but help him in the application of that resemblance which the Apostle makes between Christ and *Melchisedech*. Heb. 7.3.

QUERIE XIV.

Whether may not the question, about the appropriate subject of Baptisme, as it is stated by the brethren of new Baptisme, in opposition to the judgement and practice (almost) of the whole Christian World, justly be numbred amongst those questions, which the Apostle calls foolish, and unlearned, *and adviseth both* Timothy *and* Titus *to avoid, as being questions wich* ingender strife, *and are unprofitable and vaine?* 2 Tim. 2.23. Tit. 3.9.

Reason.

1. If the Querie had been, whether such a question as this, *viz.* who

who was *Melchisedech*'s Father, whether *Noah* or some other man; or whether the law of Circumcision in the equity of it be not yet in force as to the intituling of Infants to Baptisme, and to be as a Standard by which to judge *the observation of Gospel Rites unavailable as to the commending of a man to God*; I say if the Querie had been, whether such questions as these are not to be numbred with those that are unlearned, unprofitable, and vaine? I could easily have consented in the affirmative: because the Apostle in that place quoted by the Querist, *Tit.* 3. 9. doth point at these questions about Genealogies, and strivings about the Law, as specially intended by him. And what questions or strivings about the Law, if not whether Circumcision were not yet in use under the Gospel, since the same Apostle in the same Epistle, *chap.* 1. 10. calls *those of the Circumcision vaine talkers*, and vain talkers, or vaine talke, or such questions, as were unprofitable and vaine, agree well enough to meet in the same persons:

2. But that *the question about the appropriate subject of Baptisme*, if stated according to truth, though in opposition to (almost) the whole world called Christian, or if but agitated and debated in order to the finding out the minde of God thereabout, should deserve to be numbred with those foolish and unlearned questions which are unprofitable and vaine, I cannot believe: Because the appropriate subject of Baptisme is essentiall to the Ordinance it selfe; neither is that any more the Baptisme of Christ, which is applyed to any other subject then he hath appointed, then that would be the punitive, or remunerative Justice of the Parliament, in case another man should be punished, or rewarded by him, or them, whom they intrust with the executive part, instead of him whom the Parliament hath commanded to be so and so dealt withall: or then that would have beene Gods Circumcision, if any instead of his Males, should have circumcised his Females. And surely if the true being and administration of Baptisme, and the fulfilling of the command of Christ thereabout, does depend upon the knowledge of the appropriate subject of Baptisme; then doubtlesse, an earnest enquiry after, and serious debates about the appropriate subject of Baptisme can be no foolish or unlearned question, neither unprofitable

fitable nor vaine; unleſſe we will ſuppoſe true Baptiſme it ſelfe, and the command of Chriſt thereabout, to be unprofitable and vaine; which to queſtion whether it were, would be indeed a queſtion unprofitable and vaine, whatever wiſdome or learning otherwiſe might ſeem to be in it.

But as touching the reaſons, which ſeem to induce the Querift to conceive, that the aforeſaid queſtion ought to be numbred with tranſgreſſors: 1. It does not follow, that the queſtion about the appropriate ſubject of Baptiſme is therefore unprofitable, unlearned, fooliſh and vaine, becauſe upon debates about it, ſtrifes, contentions, evill ſurmiſings, diviſions, and revilings, and the like, have occaſionally taken place in the world; no more then it will follow, that becauſe ſuch things as theſe were occaſioned by Chriſt Jeſus himſelfe in bringing his Goſpel into the world, *Luke* 12.50,51. and by the Apoſtles preaching of it, 1 *Theſ.* 2.2. that therefore the doctrine of that Goſpel ought juſtly to be numbred with the aforeſaid vaine queſtions.

Nor, 2. can I be of opinion with the Querift, that the ſaid queſtion (rightly underſtood) in the nature and tendency of it, leads but to very little that is conſiderable, or of conſequence for a Chriſtian to know, at leaſt ſo little, as to make it unprofitable and vaine: becauſe the knowledge of the Ordinance it ſelfe, and of its nature, uſe, and tendency, depends upon the knowledge of the appropriate ſubject as one of the eſſentialls of it: and I cannot judge the knowledge and underſtanding the counſell of God in that Ordinance, a matter of ſo little moment, as to render the queſtion about it, the enquiring after it, a vain thing. Nor doe I underſtand how *the knowledge that comes by the ventilation of it, might arrive at the underſtandings of men, in a more peaceable, and leſſe troubleſome way*, then by pleadings, arguings, and debatings, unleſſe every man would of himſelfe fall in with the truth, which if they would, there would then be no need to contend earneſtly for the faith once given to the Saints, as now there is.

Nor yet 3. can I jump with that conjecture, that thoſe *who are confident they have found the treaſure of truth*, viz. the appropriate ſubject of Baptiſme (eſpecially if upon that diſcovery, they have in conſcience to God, acted according to their light) *are rather*

ther impoverished, then Spiritually enriched by it; because I suppose that which makes the Querist thus to judge, is but his mistaking one thing for another, viz. their former tameneſſe and silent submiſſion to the judgements of their guides, for their ſweetneſſe, meekneſſe, humility, love, patience, and ſoberneſſe of minde, and likewiſe their preſent activity and zeale for the truth, and the propagation of it, and the drawing of others into the ſame participation, and their impugning that by which they have found themſelves deceived, for raſhneſſe, pride, frowardneſſe, conceitedneſſe, and the like. For otherwiſe (except ſome (as in the beſt Churches of old) by whom offences will come) I truſt, in their owne cauſe, and in the tenor of their lives, he may diſcerne the ſame humility, meekneſſe, ſweetneſſe, love, patience, ſoberneſſe of minde, mortification to the world, heavenlineſſe of diſpoſition, endeavours of doing good, which was found in them before, not to boaſt of what additions God hath thereupon made to their ſpirituall ſtore; unleſſe his judgements concerning theſe, ſhould be prejudiced by ſome alteration in his affection to the perſons themſelves, and then it is an eaſie matter indeed, to be ſo taken up with that onely which is troubleſome, as to neglect and overlooke that which would be more lovely in his eye, if minded.

XV. *Querie anſwered.*

This Querie runs upon a like miſtake with the tenth Querie, as ſupplying that departure he ſpeakes of, to proceed onely from a conceit that the Church departed from, does not in all things walk according to Goſpel-rule: whereas the ſeparation proceeds not from the manner of their walking, ſuppoſing them to be a Church, but from the apprehenſion that ſuch and ſuch perſons, though Believers, are no right conſtituted Church according to Goſpell-rule; and therefore cannot by walking with them, owne them for ſuch, without approving in act what is diſallowed in judgement. This Querie might be retorted upon the Querift for his excommunicating the Church of *England* from his ſociety; but I ſhall now intend brevity.

XVI. *Querie anſwered.*

To this Querie I ſhall ſay, That the Commiſſion of Chriſt to bap-

baptise upon their believing, all that by teaching were brought to believe, and the force of examples in Scripture answering this Commission, and other Scriptures importing all of the Church to be incorporated by Baptisme, as in our answer to the first and third Queries is more particularly declared. This is sufficient ground for us to conclude, that the converts at *Antioch* in *Pisidia*, and *Iconium*, *Acts* 13. 43. and 14. 1. were baptized by *Paul* and *Barnabas*, who converted them, before such time they departed and left them; unless you will suppose *Paul* and *Barnabas* to neglect their duties towards those converts, which if it could be proved they did, yet would be no ground for Believers now to neglect theirs.

But why should the Querist presume any more of *Paul* and *Barnabas* their holding Church-communion with these converts, then of their being baptised, the one being no more mentioned then the other? or why should he suppose that they had more opportunity to put them into Church-order, and to joyn in communion therupon, then to baptise them?

XVII. *Query answered.*

This Querie being much of the same import with the tenth and fifteenth Queries, the same Answer will serve. For the Querist both in this and several other Queries, mis-represents and mistakes the case in question: for the question is not whether a Member of a Christian Church may withdraw his communion because of some defect or errour in the Church, (which yet is the thing queried, and I have elsewhere answered that he may not) but the question, if rightly stated, would be, whether a company of Believers, though unbaptised, either are, or may become, whilst such, a true visible Church according to Gospel-order? or whether a man, who upon satisfactory grounds, doth verily deem them not so to be, may yet hold communion with them as if they were such, until he hath with long suffering endeavoured to convince them that they are no Church indeed according to Scripture-account? For otherwise, the Querist does but beg the question, and then taking it as granted him, (which is utterly denyed) proceeds to render a separation unreasonable upon account of sin or that failing in the Church, as indeed well he might,

taught, if that were true which he supposes, touching the constitutive being of the Church.

And therefore the businesse may be brought into a narrower compasse, then so many queries extend to as are imployed hereabout. For let the Querist prove us from the Word of God (which is that which onely ought to sway us in this matter) either, 1. That a company of Believers without Baptisme, may become truly, and according to Gospel order, a Church of Christ visibly constituted, or else 2. That a man who knowes, or upon Scripture grounds does believe a company of men and women to be no Church, according to such order, though Believers, unlesse they were *Baptized into Jesus Christ*, may notwithstanding this his knowledge of perfwasion, hold communion with them as if they were such a Church, untill he hath convinced them that they are not: and then these things being proved, I suppose the contest will be ended.

For had the Querist himselfe been satisfied touching the due constitution of the Church of *England*, of which he once professed himselfe a Member, I suppose he would not have deemed the errours in it to have been a just ground of his separation from it, since we read of very foule evills in some of the primitive Churches themselves, but doe not finde the sound party exhorted to separate from the corrupt, but to proceed against them in a Church-way for their cure, by admonition, conviction, and excommunication in case of obstinacy.

XVIII. *Querie answered.*

What is said to the next precedent Querie will be a full and pertinent answer to this, and therefore shall say no more to it.

XIX. *Querie answered.*

To this I say, that what ever else a company of true Believers have done, yet if they have not done that which is necessary upon Scripture account to render themselves a true Church according to Gospel order, then it is not unreasonable for a Christian to deny them to be such a Church. But yet for all that, it does not follow that such a denyall renders them but as a rabble rout of the world; because unbaptized Believers are a third thing, neither

neither properly of the rabble rout of the world, nor yet formerly of the Church, (as a man that having ſerved an apprenticeſhip, and is not yet made free of the Company of which his Maſter is, neither ſervant, nor freeman in the interim) but have ſo far left the world, as that they want nothing but an orderly induction to be of the Church.

Nor can it be concluded, that becauſe ſuch have diligently enquired after the minde of God, and have ſought direction from him hereabout, that therefore the way they are in muſt needes be right, any more then that thoſe that practiſe contrary to them in this particular, upon like diligent ſearch and ſeeking of God, muſt needs upon that account not be in the wrong: for they cannot both be in the right, and yet both ſearch and ſeek; for the rule remains the ſame, and will not bow at any mans intreaty, and that's it by which the one and the other muſt be tryed.

XX. *Querie anſwered.*

To this I anſwer, 1. I have already ſaid, and now ſay it againe, that a man may not depart from, much leſſe *bid defiance to a Church, becauſe that Church cannot ſay* Amen *to every notion or conceit of his*; Nay I will ſay more, he may not, though that Church does not agree with every ſober and ſavory apprehenſion of his, ſuppoſing them ſtill to be a Church, duly ſo called, from their due conſtitution.

2. Though there is no example in Scripture of any mans being baptiſed after the profeſſion of his faith, who had been baptiſed before in his infancy, becauſe when the Scriptures were written, there was no ſuch thing as the baptizing of Infants practiſed, by which to give opportunity of ſuch an example; yet if Infant-Baptiſme cannot be proved to be that Baptiſme which Chriſt requires his Diſciples to ſubmit to, and conſequently is none of his Baptiſme, but the Baptiſme of Man, then Infant-Baptiſme and no Baptiſme are of one and the ſame conſideration; and if ſo, then there is example and precept enough in Scripture for ſuch Believers to be once baptiſed, who never have been baptiſed before; and therefore the caſe is not ſo plain, as the Querift ſuppoſes, that there is no precept or example which warranteth the practiſe of the Children of after-Baptiſme, as he calls them.

But

But the Querist hath given himself an Answer to this Querie by the matter of his 7. and 8. Queries, to which I referre him for further resolution in this.

XXI. *Query answered.*

Answer, 1. If by Christians, the Querist meanes no more then true Believers in Christ Jesus, then I know none that so magnifie the Ceremony or externall Rite of Baptisme, as to judge none Christians without it; nay the truth is, it is because we judge the Querist and others true Believers, that we do perswade them to be baptised.

But if by Christians he meanes such as according to the Word have put on Christ, then we must say, that those that by being baptised into Christ, have not put on Christ, are not yet such Christians as they ought to be. *Gal.* 3. 27. And yet it does not follow, that they who so say, *do stumble at the same stone of danger, and perill of soul, at which the Jews stumbled* (if they were Jews) when they urged and practised circumcision as necessary for justification, *Gal.* 5. 2. because they urged and practised that for necessary which was now abolished; we that which is commanded and remaines in force, we urge Baptisme to be necessary as a precept of Christ, and necessary as a means of salvation; they perhaps judged Circumcision as other works of the Law, meritorious, according to the Querists owne declared judgement upon another occasion. And therefore I doubt the Querist does not deale so kindely with the Ordinance of Baptisme, nor the Baptists themselves, as he should doe, in that he puts the one but much what in the same capacity with Circumcision, as it was at that time when *Paul* said of it, *If ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing*; and in that he yokes the Baptists, who onely urge Baptisme as one of the precepts of Christ, and a meanes of salvation, as the Scriptures themselves doe, with those that urged the abrogated Ceremony of Circumcision, as necessary unto Justification, as the Querist himselfe supposes. Truly I doubt the comparison in both respects, is odious with God, whatever it is with Men.

XXII. *Query answered.*

That which will be very well worth our noting here in the first

place, is, how the truth which we plead hath gained a faire and ample acknowledgement, even from the Querist himselfe in this Querie, though he oppose it in others. For he does not only demand whether there be any precept or example in Scripture for the baptising of any person after many yeares profession of the Gospell; but also, whether there be any precept or example in Scripture for the baptising of any person, *at any other time*, SAVE AT, OR ABOUT *their first entrance upon a profession of Christ?* And not onely so neither, but further demands, Whether *there be any competent ground, either in Reason or Religion, why either such a thing should have beene practised by Christians in the Apostles dayes, or why it ought to be practised by any in those dayes?* By which I am sure he sayes as much to the condemnation of Infant-Baptisme, as lightly can be spoken in so few words; and in substance as much as ever any man did say in opposition to that practise.

For if there be neither precept nor example in Scripture, for the baptising of any person, *at any other time* SAVE *at or about the time of their first entrance upon the profession of Christ*; nor yet *competent ground in Reason or Religion*, why it should otherwise be practised: then certainly there is neither precept or example in Scripture for the baptising of Infants, nor yet any competent ground why such a thing should be practised; and the reason is, because Infants in their infancy can make no profession of Christ, nor doe they in their infancy make any entrance upon a profession of Christ.

Neither let any man think that I wrong the Querist in wresting his words contrary to his intention; For though I believe that which I infer from them, was no part of his intention, yet I doe not wrest his words, but onely infer from them that which must be true, if that which he sayes downe queric-wise for a truth, be a truth. And it is a thing not unusuall for persons who plead the cause of any errour in Religion, at one turne or other, to utter that which cuts the throat of their own tenent.

But now to answer to that which the Querist intends indeed.

1. If there be no example in Scripture of any mans being baptised, after many yeares profession of the Gospell, it is because there is no example in Scripture of any such sinfull negligence in

Believers, are to continue many yeares in the profession of the Gospell without being baptised; if there were any lingering and delaying in this case, they were awakened to their duty, as many Believers have now need to be: *And now, why tarryest thou? Arise and be baptised, Acts* 22. 16. If then Believers in these dayes have been more remisse and negligent in yeilding obedience to Christ in this command of his, then Believers were in the Apostles dayes, well may it serve to humble and to shame them, but by no meanes to encourage them to persevere in that neglect.

2. Christ Jesus himselfe would be baptised, because he would fulfill that law of righteousnesse which enjoyned Baptisme, (*Mat.* 23. 15.) though otherwise he had as little need of it as the greatest he, that thinks his long standing, and great attainments in Christianity should priviledge him from it: and therefore methinks as such have any tenderneſſe in them, lest they should be found neglecting any righteous precept of the Gospel, or any of that zeale that was in Christ to fulfill all righteousnesse, or any such love to Christ as to tread in his steps, should not have their hands out of this businesse upon any pretence whatsoever.

3. *Cornelius* had beene a long time a fearer of God, and it is probable had knowledge of *Johns* baptising, or of *Christs* baptising long before, in as much as he was famously knowne among the Jewes; for he is said to *have a good report among all the nation of the Jewes, Acts* 10. 22. and therefore it is not unlike, but he might as well know what was done among the Jewes, as they know what was done by him: besides, *Peter* speaking to him, and those with him, saith, *That word (I say) you know which was published throughout all* Judea, *and began from* Galilee, *after the Baptisme which* John *preached, &c. Acts* 10. 37. and yet notwithstanding his long profession of the feare of God, and notwithstanding he had not been baptised when he had knowledge of others being baptised; yet such were Gods respects to this upright man, that rather then he should be any longer without a more particular knowledge of the Gospel, and without that Ordinance of the Gospel Baptisme, he spares not to send an Angel to him, to direct him to *Peter, Acts* 10. 4, 5. 48.

4. He

4. He that is baptiſed, though not till long after the time in which he began to beleeve, does not by being baptiſed, then *fall back from perfection to imperfection, from that which is more ſpiritual to that which is more carnall*, as the Queriſt ſuppoſes; becauſe he ſhall not thereby loſe any thing he had before of that which is ſpirituall, but ſhall be ſure to make a faire addition thereby unto his ſpirituall ſtock, if he doe it heartily, as unto Chriſt, and afterwards make that ſpirituall improvement of it, of which it is very capable.

5. The Ordinance of Baptiſme is as well matter of obligation, as ſignification; to oblige and hold a man faſt to the ſervice of Jeſus Chriſt, as to inſtruct him in the things of the Goſpel: upon which account *Paul* preſſes the improvement of it upon the beleeving *Romans*, (*Rom.*6.3 4,5.) ſo long after they had begun to beleeve, as that their faith by that time was growne famous *throughout the whole world*, chap. 1. ver. 8. And what, hath not even the ſtrongeſt Chriſtian himſelfe, need of all the holy bonds and ingagements of the Goſpel, to engage and binde him faſter and faſter to Chriſt, and to preſſe him more and more forward in his way?

6. Baptiſme as well as the Table of the Lord, is *remembrative*, yea in ſome reſpect more; for the Supper properly is but *remembrative* of the death of Chriſt, whereas Baptiſme is *remembrative*, and declarative of the Death, Buriall, and Reſurrection of Chriſt. And therefore the Queriſts reaſon being built upon this miſtaken ſuppoſition, that Baptiſme is not *remembrative* as well as the Table of the Lord, is invalid, as to render Baptiſme any more unneceſſary to men of long profeſſion, then the Supper it ſelfe is unneceſſary for them.

7. What ever elſe they have profeſſed, I am ſure they have not profeſſed ſo much, and ſo far as they ought, who by being baptiſed into Chriſt, have not profeſſed the Death, Buriall, and Reſurrection of Chriſt, and their owne Death, Buriall, and Reſurrection with him.

8. There can no more reaſon be given (as I conceive) why Baptiſme ſhould ceaſe to be a duty to a believer becauſe he hath omitted it in the propereſt ſeaſon of it, *viz.* the time of his new birth, then why Circumciſion ſhould ceaſe to be a duty to

the

the *Israelites*, having omitted it many years after the eighth day of their Age, which was the proper time for it; and yet we see such an Omission in them, did not cause Circumcision to cease to be a duty to them, though perhaps the ground of their Omission, was much more approveable, or at least excusable before God, then the ground of that Omission of Baptisme, of which we speak, can well be conceived to be, *Josh.5.7.*

9. An Omission or neglect of Baptisme by the Believers, let it be under what pretence soever it will, is guilty of an unkindnesse to God, and to Jesus Christ, in that they doe not *Justifie God* in the face of the World, in that as well as in any other way and in that they doe not *put on the Lord Jesus* in Baptisme, as the first and best approved Believers did; *Luke* 7. 29. *Gal.*3.27.

10. Such Believers as neglect Baptisme, upon a supposall they have no need of it, because of their long standing in Christianity, are unmercifull to their owne soules, in cutting themselves short of such a meanes or spirituall accommodation as Baptisme is, and doe offer injury both to that Wisdome and Goodnesse of God, which consulted their good in that Ordinance: *They reject the Counsell of God against themselves in not being Baptized*, Luke 7.30.

XXIII. Querie Answered.

1. *If the Law of Edification, ought to over-rule all Lawes and Precepts concerning spirituall Church-administrations, as the Law of Salus populi ought in things civill*, as the Querist supposes, and takes for granted from 1 *Cor.* 14. 26. Then the Administration of Baptisme ought rather to be appropriated to persons professing the Faith, then unto Infants, and not the contrary as the Querist would have it: and the reason hereof is, because Baptisme is more edifying both to the Baptized themselves, and also to others, when administered to persons professing the Faith, then when to Infants. And this must needs be so, because Infants by reason of their want of understanding and Faith, are not capable of receiving that Spirituall edification by Baptisme; nor of improving it unto their Spirituall advantage, as those are that have the Use and Exercise of understanding and Faith too.

Nor is the administration of Baptisme, like to be so taking with others that are but Spectators, either as to the informing of their judgements, or moving of their affections, when applied to a Creature (as an Infant is,) expressing no knowledge of God, or *Jesus Christ*, nor Love or Obedience to him, or any desire to his wayes, as the same would be, when administred to a Believer, who by his voluntary submission to that Ordinance, Preaches to men his beliefe in *Jesus Christ*, as Dead, Buried, and Risen againe; And his expectation of Remission of sins through Faith in his Name, and their own desires; and resolutions, of giving up themselves wholly unto *Jesus Christ*; unlesse you will suppose, there is no difference betweene zeale and no zeale in this behalfe, which cannot be supposed without contradicting the Spirit of those and the like Scriptures, *Mat.* 21.32. with *Luke* 7. 29,30. *Cor.* 9.2.

2. I cannot be of the Querists minde (I confesse) *that Circumcision and Baptisme are the same in Spirit and Substance, though differing in the Letter*; Because circumcision was no signe or resemblance of the Death, Buriall, and Resurrection of Christ, and of Mens Death, Buriall, and Refurrection with him, which yet the Scripture makes to be the spirit of Baptisme, *Rom.* 6. 3, 4,5. *Col.* 2. 12. And therefore this reason, is no reason, either why Baptisme should rather appropriately belong to Infants, rather then any others, or indeed that it should belong to them or all, though Circumcision did.

3. Whereas the Querist directs us, *diligently to compare*, *Rom.* 4.11. with *Marke* 1.4. *Luke* 3. 3. &c. out of which to finde that Baptisme and Circumcision are one in strength and substance of Spirit; I confesse I have diligently considered these Texts, and till I did diligently consider them, was of the Querists mind herein, but by a diligent considering of them, am now of another minde.

I suppose the Querist would have us to conceive from these Scriptures, that Circumcision was a Seale of the Righteousnesse which comes by Faith, and Baptisme a Seale of the Righteousnesse wich comes by Repentance, and therefore the same Spiritually. But what relation soever Baptisme hath to Repentance (is indeed I no where finde it called a Seale of the righteousnesse

ouſneſſe of Repentance) yet confident I am, that when the Apoſtle calls Circumciſion, *A Seale of the Righteouſneſſe of that Faith which* Abraham *had before he was circumciſed*, hee does not deſcribe the common nature of Circumcision, as he had done in thoſe words imediately before, where he calls it a Signe, which agrees with Gods own Denomination of it when he firſt inſtituted it, and therefore moſt likely adequately to anſwer the common end and uſe of it; But hee deſcribes Circumciſion in theſe words, *A Seale of the Righteouſneſſe, &c.* as that which it was peculiarly to *Abraham*. For 1. It is not called a Seale of the Righteouſneſſe of Faith indefinitely, but onely *A Seale of the Righteouſneſſe of the Faith which* H E H A D. And 2. *A Seale of the Righteouſneſſe of the Faith which he had, being yet uncircumciſed.* And then 3. The end wherefore Circumciſion became ſuch a Seale of the Righteouſneſſe of *Abrahams* Faith, and it was this, T H A T *hee might be the Father of all them that believe.*

And were not theſe things, in reſpect whereof Circumciſion was a Seale, peculiar unto *Abraham* onely? Or did God ever give Circumciſion (as is ſaid, *he gave to* Abraham *the Covenant of Circumciſion*, Acts 7. 8.) to any other as the Seale of the Righteouſneſſe of the Faith which he had before he was Circumciſed, or to ratifie and eſtabliſh him the Father of all that ſhould afterward believe? If not, why ſhould we thinke Circumciſion was in common a Seale of the Righteouſneſſe of Faith to other men, as long as the reaſons wherefore it is ſo called, are peculiar unto *Abraham* alone?

The Apoſtles ſcope here, was, (as will appeare in the Context) to prove that Circumciſion did contribute nothing in the buſineſſe of juſtification: and this hee proves, in that *Abraham* was juſtified before Circumciſed; and not onely ſo, but his very receiving of Circumciſion from God upon theſe termes hee did receive it, was an evidence or demonſtration, that *Abraham* was juſtified in the ſight of God before hee received it, and that he did receive it for ſuch an end, as that he might ſtand declared under this Seale of God, as a Man of ſuch high acceptation with God, as to be thereupon called and accounted the Father, the famous example and patterne of all

those that should believe. And if *Abraham* did receive Circumcision, as a Testimoniall of that love which God did beare to him before, (as *Nehemiah* sayes, that God *found his heart faithfull before him, and entered into Covenant with him* thereupon, *Neh.*9.8.) then it could not be the procuring cause of *Abrahams* acceptation with God. This construction of the word then, so directly answering and accommodating the drift and Scope of the Apostle, I see no reason to embrace any other that is contrary to it.

For to understand the Apostle as speaking of Circumcision in the common nature of it, as a Seale of the Righteousnesse of Faith, seemes to mee rather to disaccomodate the Apostle in his intendment then otherwise; Since those with whom *Paul* here disputes, might rather thereby be confirmed in their Opinion of the necessity of Circumcision unto Justification, since things (writings for example) are not authentick till they are Sealed, and therefore should *Paul* have told them, that Circumcision had been the Seale of Justification, might not they have inferred, that therefore justification could not be compleat without it?

3. Should wee grant that which the Querist would have, *viz.* That Circumcision and Baptisme were the same in Spirit and Substance, (which yet we may not grant) yet that would by no meanes follow thereupon, which the Querist supposeth, *viz.* That Baptisme is, and Circumcision was, most edifying when administred to Infants; *Or else that Circumcision was ordered by God, unto the Spirituall losse and detriment of those to whom it was enjoyned.* For this Assertion cannot be true, unlesse you will suppose that which is manifestly untrue, *viz.* That there is no mean betweene most edifying, and none at all; or which is more, that there is no mean betweene *MOST edifying*, and *Spirituall losse and detriment.* For Circumcision might have been edifying (as administred to Children) to the first or second degree of Edification, and yet neither be *most Edifying*, nor yet matter of *Spirituall detriment*; unlesse the comparatives of Lesse and More, were not in use in those days. I will willingly grant, that the whole ministration of *Moses*, was edifying to a degree, and therefore Circumcision also, though administred to Infants, in

some

some respect or other; but I shall withall deny, that it or Circumcision as administred to Infants, was Most edifying; for then it should have remained still as the Apostle saith, *Heb.* 8. 7. *If that first Covenant had been faultlesse, then should no place have been sought for the second.*

It was then because of that little, low, and meane degree of Spirituall benefit or edification that was to be had by Circumcision as administred to Infants, or by other Rites or Ordinances of the Law, that the same were abrogated and made void, as is most evident also by that other saying of the Apostle, *Heb.* 7. 18, 19. *For there is verily a disanulling of the Commandement going before, for the weakenesse and unprofitablenesse of it: for the Law made nothing perfect.* If so, is it not most unreasonable to say, that the Law, or any part of it, and particularly Circumcision as administred to Infants, was most edifying? Or if it were most edifying according to the [redacted] of Gods Dispensation for the time then being, is there any shew or appearance of reason in it, that an administration to Infants must be most edifying now under the Gospell; because such a thing was the most edifying way which God was pleased to vouchsafe the Church in her non-age under the Law? when as it is plaine that as edifying as it was, it was disanulled for the unprofitablenesse of it.

4. What ever the confidence of the Querist is to the contrary, yet there is not onely a colour of reason, but the substance of reason also why Baptisme should not be so edifying as to its end, when administred to Infants, as Circumcisian was and might be, as to its end, when it was administred to Infants; because Circumcision was no such transient act as Baptisme is, but such as remained a permanent signe in the flesh as a visible matter of signification and instruction to the party circumcised all his dayes, (*Gen.* 17. 13.) which is a thing, that no man can affirm of Infants Baptisme.

XXIV. *Querie Answered.*

That the Baptizing of Infants in the Apostles dayes, is not *sufficiently*, or at all signified by those Scriptures which mention the Baptizing of housholds, *Acts* 16. 15. 33. 1 *Cor.* 1. 16. will

sufficiently appeare. 1. Because the houſholds whoſe being Baptized, is recorded, being onely but three, it may with as good probability be affirmed, that there were no little Children in them, as that there were, and in that reſpect we are upon equall ground with our friends, in denying, what they take liberty only to ſuppoſe. 2. If there were Infants in thoſe houſholds, yet the word Houſe, or Houſhold, in Scripture frequently imports, not all and every individuall Soule in the houſe, but either the major part, or ſo many of the houſe, which according to common reaſon, are to be ſuppoſed capable of thoſe affirmations that are made concerning them. 1 *Sam.* 1.21, 22. *Gen.* 50. 4. & 35. 2. 2 *Sam.* 3.1. *Jer.* 35.3. 18. *Mat.* 10. 13. & 12. 25. *John* 4. 53. *Acts* 18.8 & 10.2 *Joſh.* 24.15. 2 *Tim.* 4.19. *Rom.* 16.10, 11. And accordingly muſt thoſe Scriptures be underſtood where houſholds are ſaid to be Baptized. 3. In that it is ſaid concerning one of the three houſholds whoſe Baptiſme is recorded, *That the Word of the Lord was ſpoken to them, and that they believed*, *Acts* 16.34. and of another, *that they addicted themſelves to the Miniſtery of the Saints*, 1 *Cor.* 16.15. with *Chap.* 1. *v.* 16. It is evident, that either there were no Infants in thoſe houſholds, or elſe that when they ſpeake of houſholds, they meane onely ſuch of them, as had attained the age of ſo much underſtanding, as to doe, heare, and believe ſuch things, as were incompetible to the capacity of Infants or little Children.

To the reaſons moving the Queriſt to thinke Infants were Baptized, when theſe houſholds were Baptized, I anſwer,

1. *That God hath not left the Precept, and perpetuall example of Circumciſing Infants as a pit uncovered, (for Believers to fall into by Baptizing their Children) by giving no hint of the alteration of his minde in that behalfe:* For in that hee hath in the New Teſtament, aboliſhed the uſe and practice of Circumciſing Infants, its cleare hee hath aboliſhed the Law by which Circumciſion of Infants was enjoyned. But hee hath done the former, *Acts* 21.21. 1 *Cor.* 7.19. *Gal.* 5.2. Therefore the latter. And therefore conſidering that the Law of Circumciſion, as all other *Moſaicall* Rites, being diſanulled, I cannot but wonder, that any man ſhould build any thing upon it for the Baptizing of Infants: Is not a repealed Law, and no Law, of the ſame

consideration, as to its being any ground of practice?

But may wee not much rather conceive, that since God did make a Law against mans *opening, or digging a pit in his field, and not covering it*, to prevent the miscarriage of Man or Beast, in falling into it, *Exod.* 21.33. that then surely, he himselfe would never have left *the Precept, and perpetuall example* of Baptizing Beleevers, as *a Pit uncovered* for Christians to fall into, by neglecting to Baptize their Children till they repent and beleeve, without giving the least notice of his mind and will to have any other then such Beleevers to be Baptized, if yet it had beene his minde that Children should have been baptized?

2. That which the Querist offers to render children to be Beleevers in Scripture-sence, is insufficient as to the entitling of them to Baptism, or to cause us rationally to conceive them included in their number, who in the houshold aforesaid, are said to have beleeved. For 1. If it should be granted that children may be called Beleevers, not because they doe beleeve indeed, but because they are in like state and condition with Beleevers, in respect of the love and favour of God, and their Title to the Kingdome of Heaven, which yet is all the Querist argues from *Mat.* 18. 6. Yet what is this to the proving of them actuall Beleevers, or such as imbraced the Gospell, or were made to beleeve by teaching? which yet were that kinde of Beleevers onely, unto whom Baptisme was, or was to be administred, for so much as appeares throughout the whole New Testament. But 2. The truth is, the *little ones* which are said to beleeve in *Christ*, *Mat.* 18. 6. cannot with any congruity of reason be supposed to be any such *little ones*, as Infants are: Because they are described by an Act which presupposeth, not only the Faculty, but the Use, Act and Exercise of the understanding; for so the Act of beleeving in *Christ* does, by which they are described, which yet as all men know, is incompetible to Infants. And therefore we must suppose, either 1. That the *Child which Jesus called to him, Ver.* 2. was of so much understanding as rendred him capable of beleeving, (and it was such a Child as came upon the call of *Jesus*:) or else 2. *That the little ones, ver.* 6. which are said to *believe*, are not the same with that little Child mentioned, *ver.* 2. And there are these two reasons why they should not

be

be thought the same. 1. Because *ver.* 5. speakes of one Child onely in the singular number, but *ver.* 6. speakes of *little ones* in the plurall number, and that too, not under the appellation of Child or Children as before, but of *little ones.* 2. If we compare this passage with the other Evangelists, as *Mark* 9.42. *Luke* 17.2. It will bee evident (as it is rendred by them) that *little ones*, were not little Babes, or little Children properly so called, but the Disciples of *Christ*, whom he frequently calls *little ones*, and sometimes *little Children*, *John* 13.33.

2. But that which is further added by the Querist, why Infants *can upon no tolerable account be excluded, when it is said of whole Households or Families, that they were dipped, though it should be supposed, they were in no sence capable of believing*, is I confesse to mee reasonable, and it is, *because they were as capable*, and in some respects more capable of being dipt, then Men: as if their being capable *de facto* to be dipped, must needs argue them capable *de jure* of the Ordinance of Baptisme as well as Men: Such a capacity, not onely Infants, but other Creatures also have as well as Men; and if this had been all the capacity requisite, no doubt but Children had been as capable as any, yea and other Creatures too.

3. Is that a good reason why we should thinke Children were Baptized with the households before mentioned, *because We ought not to contend with God, or refuse any part of his Counsell or Will because onely somewhat sparingly, and with some scantinesse of evidence discovered in his word?* Nay rather, since the Will of God is herein manifest, that persons professing the Faith were the subject of his Baptisme, all the while the Scriptures, and the History of things then, were in composing, let no man contend with God, because he hath not framed the Scripture to his mind or opinion, nor goe about to force the Scripture to speake that they have no minde to speake, or suppose when God hath delivered his Mind plainly; That yet he hath thoughts and counsells of another nature, more comporting with his minde, (as *Baalam* sometime thought in another case.)

4. The Querist supposes severall other Tenents to be imbraced, *upon weaker and lesse lightsome grounds, then such as are given for Infant-Baptisme*: but that hee should mention the admission

mission of women to the Lords Table for one of these tenents, is a confest matter of wonder to me; for there is both precept and example, upon which this tenent is grounded, but neither the one, nor the other, for the baptising of Infants; and therefore how the ground for this should be more lightsome, then for the other, is that which passes my reason to comprehend.

For matter of precept, for admitting women to the Table of the Lord, we have it in these words, *Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that Bread, and drink of that Cup*, 1 Cor. 11. 28. For I doubt not but the Querist well knowes, that Man in this place is the common gender, & signifies the kind and not the sex, and therefore women to be every whit as much concerned therein, as men.

For example, we have it *Acts* 2.42. compared with *Acts* 1. 14. and 2. 16.18. For in the former place we finde the three thousand that were added, together with those to whom they were added, continued in fellowship and breaking of bread. In the other places, we finde that among those Disciples, to whom the three thousand were added, there were Women, and Handmaids of the Lord, and therefore it is every whit as plaine from this place, that women did break bread, as that men did. And when it's said *Acts* 20.7. *That the Disciples came together to break Bread upon the first day of the Weeke*, why should it be understood of men any more then women? in as much as women are Disciples as well as men, unlesse haply it be said, there is particular mention made of *Paul* and *Eutychus*.

And now let the Querist produce us more lightsome grounds, then precept and example for his sprinkling of Infants, or else forbeare this comparison.

XXV. *Querie answered.*

If *a baptismall sprinkling* of an Infant (as the Querist's expression is, which is as much as to say, a sprinkling by dipping) be no more the Ordinance of Baptisme, then another common action is, (as I verily presume it is not, till it be proved to be of a divine appointment) then the baptismall sprinkling the Querist speaks of, varies the case of baptising one after this sprinkling, no more then the baptising of one after the doing of any Ordi-

much

naria and common action: and therefore it might with as [illegible] reason, in my opinion, have been demanded, whether the [illegible] sing of one who hath been so and so nursed, so and so attended, so and so attired in his infancy, be any where countenanced in Scripture, by particularity or expressenesse of precept or example, as whether the submitting to a baptismall dipping, after a baptismall sprinkling, be so countenanced. But as touching particularity of precept or example in such cases, I have answered more largely to querie 1.7.8.21.

And whereas the Querist further demands, *Whether they doe not presume as much, or rather more upon their owne judgements and understandings, in making Infant-Baptisme a meere nullity, the Scripture giving no such sentence against it, as they do who make it an Ordinance of God, or a meer and necessary administration of an Ordinance?* I answer, No, they doe not: Because they doe not proceed upon their owne judgement onely, but upon Scripture-ground, who reject every administration which is obtruded as necessary, which hath no footing in the Word of God: *For every Plant which the heavenly Father hath not planted, is to be plucked up*, Mat. 15. 13. though every such Plant which men have, or shall plant, upon their owne judgements onely, as Infant-Baptisme, crosse in Baptisme, Surplice upon the Priests back, and many others, be not particularly mentioned in Scripture; yet it is sufficient that we have that generall warrant to reject all that is not of Gods planting. But now, they that shall practise Infant-sprinkling as an Ordinance, or as a necessary Administration of an Ordinance of God, without warrant from God, they plant and not God, which plant is to be rooted up, and rejected by those that will side with God, against the corruptions and superstitions of men. And therefore whereas the Querist makes that a reason of the practise of Infant-Baptisme, *viz.* because, as he sayes, Infants (at least of Believers) are no where excluded by God from part and fellowship in that administration, it is nothing but what hath been, and with as good a shew of reason may be pleaded by the Papists, for many of their superstitious customes and traditions; for neither are they by name excluded the parts of Gods worship. But we say, that Infant-Baptisme and what ever else is obtruded as necessary in the Worship and

Ordi-

Ordinances of God, which he hath not made so by some word of his or other, is by vertue of that generall rule which warrants the plucking up every Plant that is not planted by God, to be rejected by men as *will-worship*, and the serving of God, *according to the precepts of men*. Col. 2. 18. 23. Isa. 29. 13.

XXVI. *Querie answered.*

1. I might here observe the discordancy and incongruity of this Querie, with severall that have gone before it: For whereas this renders the neglect of Baptisme so dangerous, as that the heavy hand of God may well be feared as the punishment of such a sinne, yet severall other precedent queries have rendered it so venialll a sinne, as that it would be unreasonable for the sake thereof, to barre any from Church-communion.

2. But to answer directly, I suppose it will not be denyed by the Baptists queried, but that Baptisme is as necessary, and of as high esteeme with God under the Gospell, as Circumcision was under the Law; and that they who neglect it whose duty it is to submit to it (the Querists I mean, and other Believers) have cause to feare the displeasure of God, as well as those who neglected Circumcision under the Law. But where there is no Law, there is no transgression, and where no transgression, no feare of wrath: if then there is no command from God to baptise Infants, as there was to circumcise them, (or if there be, the Pedobaptists were never yet so kinde as to shew it us) then there is no cause to feare the like danger for the forbearing of the one, as there was for neglecting of the other.

3. But though there be no cause to feare the displeasure of God for forbearing to baptise Infants, yet if there be the same cause for us to feare the displeasure of God for doing that which he hath not commanded, as there was for his people under the Law in like case, then there is just cause for those to feare the displeasure of God in one kinde or other, who though they do not *offer strange fire which God commanded not, as did Nadab and Abihu, whom the Lord slew*, Levit. 10. 1, 2. not transgresse the Order of God as *Uzza* did, who dyed before God, 1 Chron. 13. 10. with chap. 15. 13. yet doe as truly and really doe that as a service to him in sprinkling their children which he hath not commanded, as they did the other.

XXVII. *Quære answered.*

Whether the Israelites were blamelesse under the omission of Circumcision for fourty yeares together, upon account of that bodily inconvenience or danger the Quærist speakes of, I know not, I leave it to him to determine: But that a being dipped over head and eares in water, in obedience to a command of Jesus Christ, should be a tempting of the providence of God, as to the endangering of either life or health, I cannot believe; because more then frequent, even constant experience, teacheth the contrary. Nor do I believe there is the like danger or difficulty attends this dipping, as did the circumcising of those Israelites, *Josh.* 5, after they had omitted it forty yeares: and yet the danger and difficulty notwithstanding, God would have it done. What ever the danger might be for a man to be dipt upon his owne account, I shall not speak; but I am very confident, God hath not made a snare of Baptisme; and unlesse we will conceive, that God takes lesse care to preserve his people now in the times of the Gospel, from such inconveniences as these feared, in the way of serving and obeying him, then he did to preserve his people from those hazards they exposed themselves to in obeying him under the Law, *Exod.* 34.24. there will be no cause for any man to feare the miscarriage of his life or health in the hand of Jesus Christ, and in the way of obeying him; he that rebuked the Windes and the Seas for his servants sakes, can rebuke the feared cold: and though *ease slayeth the foolish, yet whoso harkeneth unto me* (saith God, *Prov.* 1.32,33.) *shall dwell safely, and shall be free from the feare of evill.* And how can he trust God *with the keeping of his soule in well doing,* 1 *Pet.* 4.19. that cannot trust him with the keeping of his body in well doing? Little does he think who ever is turned aside by this Lyon in the way, what peace and satisfaction a mans experience of the uprightnesse and cordialnesse of his heart to God will produce him, when notwithstanding the danger which flesh and bloud will suggest in the case, he can in love and obedience to his Lord and Master Jesus Christ, throw health, and life, and all into the hands of God.

XXVIII.

XXVIII. *Queries answered.*

1. If the Querist will suppose that those Scriptures which require faith, or the profession of faith in those that are to be admitted to Baptisme, are to be understood onely of men and women who are capable of making such a profession, and that they are no more exclusive of Infants, then the Apostles Injunction, 2 *Thes.* 3. 10. *If any will not worke, let him not eat*, is exclusive of Infants in the point of eating, wherein he intends men onely and not children; then I desire him to shew us what Scriptures those are, that doe speak of the baptising of infants and not of men and women professing the faith if those doe not: for if such Scriptures as require faith in those that will be baptised, doe no more intend children, then the foresaid Injunction of the Apostle doth, then there must be some other Scriptures that do intend Infants, when they speak of baptising, or else there are no Scriptures at all that doe speake of Childrens Baptisme: if there be any other, why are they not produced? if there be not, why is the world troubled with these disputes as if there were?

2. Why does not, or may not the Querist as well suppose, that those words of the Apostle, 1 *Cor.* 11. 28. *Let a man therefore examine himselfe, and so let him eat of that Bread, and drinke of that Cup*, are no more exclusive of Children then those are, *He that will not worke, let him not eat*; or then those are, which require a profession of faith before Baptisme? For may not any man that will give himselfe liberty and scope to puzzle mens understandings without plaine Scriptures, as well deny that children are debarred Communion at the Table of the Lord, by this Text which requires a man to examine himselfe in order to his approach thereto, as to deny that children are debarred Baptisme by those Scriptures that require faith in men and women to render them capable of Baptisme? if there be any difference, let us understand it; or if children be not here excluded the Supper, then shew us by what other Scripture they are: or if the Querist will grant that children are hereby excluded Communion in the Supper, then we desire him, if he can, to shew reason why such a requiring of faith in persons to bee baptised, does not as well exclude children from Baptisme, as from the Supper, there being,

being no other Scriptures that doe any more warrant the baptising of children, then the admission of them to the Supper of the Lord.

XXIX. *Queris answered.*

That dipping is of the essence and necessity of Baptisme, I conceive there is good reason to believe; But that they *are selfe-Baptisers*, who by going into the water, dispose their bodies for a burial under the water, by the hands of the Baptiser, I do no more believe, then I believe they are selfe-Murderers, or selfe-Slayers, who lay their bodyes downe, and their necks upon the block when they are to be executed.

Nor have I seene or knowne any to *convey all but the head under water in order to their being baptised, or dipped*, nor do I judge it convenient so to doe, unlesse a shallower water cannot conveniently be come at; though I believe withall, that so the body of him who is baptised, be buried under water by him that does baptise, it does not at all varie the case as to the thing of Baptisme, whether a man goe lesse or more into the water; the Scripture placing the thing, not in a mans going to the knees, or neck, in water, but in his being baptised, or buried in water.

XXX. *Queris answered.*

I demand of the Querist, whether God in the institution of Circumcision, *Gen.* 17. did any more prescribe or determine all circumstances essentiall to Circumcision, then God, then Christ have determined all circumstances requisite to Baptisme in the Commission given by them to baptise? *John* 1. *Matthew* 28. 19. Did God command Circumcision? So God, so Christ have commanded Baptisme. Did God appoint what persons should be circumcised, *viz.* every male child among the Jewes? so hath Christ who shall be baptised, *viz.* such of the nations as shall be taught or made Disciples. Did God appoint the eighth day for Circumcision? Christ hath appointed the time of Baptisme, *viz.* though not such or such a day, yet that it should follow men's being discipled or taught, without any long intermission, as the very words of the Commission doe import, and Scripture examples conforme to this Commission, doe shew. Did God direct what part of the body should be circumcised, *viz.* the flesh

of

of the fore-skin? So Christ hee hath appointed the subject matter to be Baptized, under this word or expression *THEM*, *Baptizing, them*, i.e. Such persons of the Nations as shall be taught; not this or that part of *them*, but *THEM*, even *them* themselves; by which personall expression when applied to washing or dipping, in Scripture, is wont to be signified, not the washing of this or that part, as Hands, Face, Feet, or the like, which are wont to be particularly mentioned, when no more is intended, but a totall washing or dipping, as very many learned Men, though friends to Infant-Baptism, doe also render the word Baptize to signifie.

Did God declare for what end circumcision should serve, viz. *For it shall be a token between him and his people?* So Christ in Commissionating his Disciples to *Baptize*, in, or (as it is rendred from the *Greeke*) *into* the Name of the Father, the Sonne, and the Holy Ghost, declared that Baptisme should be a solemne putting, or planting of Men, into the Father, Son, and Spirit, or into a professed expectation of Salvation from, and of the service of, and subjection to, the *Father, Son,* and *Spirit*. Nay, I may say, the Commission for Baptizing, is more particular and expresse, then that for circumcising; for here it is directed by Christ, by whom, or by what hands Baptisme shall be administred, viz. Disciples; but it is not prescribed by what hands the Males should be Circumcised, nor yet with what instrument, as viz. whether with a Knife, or sharp Stone, or the like.

And therefore, there being in the Commission of Christ to Baptize, *as much* (yea in some respects more) *particularity of subject, and manner of Administration, as was in Gods Command to Circumcise,* (and the same might be said if compared with the Passover or Supper of the Lord,) the Querist doubtlesse had no reason rashly to charge those, *with making themselves wise above that which is written, or with abounding upon the consciences of men, an institution of their own, in the name of the Ordinance and Institution of God. Who undertake to determine particularity of subjects or manner of Administration in Baptisme, which yet be dark.*

But I would demand of the Querist, *whether he doth not determine particularity of subject, and manner of Administration in Baptisme*, when he Sprinkles such and such Infants in that form and

and manner which hee uſes therein? and whether hee doe this of his own head, or by vertue of any Inſtitution or command of *Chriſt*? If he will ſay, he does it by vertue of an Inſtitution or Command from *Chriſt*, then at leaſt in his opinion there muſt be a commiſſion from *Chriſt* found in Scripture, which preſcribeth ſuch circumſtances as hee Judges eſſentiall to that adminiſtration, as well as there is for the eſſentialls of Circumciſion, Paſſover, and Supper of the Lord; if ſo, why does hee ſuppoſe there is no ſuch thing to be found in Scripture? Or if hee will ſay there is no ſuch Commiſſion in Scripture, as does *determine particularity of ſubject, and manner of Adminiſtration in Baptiſme*, as hee muſt hold, or elſe hee is to blame for changing thoſe who ever they be, *with making themſelves wiſe above that which is written, &c. That doe preſcribe and determine, particularity of ſubject, and manner of Adminiſtration in Baptiſme*; But as I ſay, if hee will ſay there is no ſuch Inſtitution, or Commiſſion, (which is equivalently the ſame) then does not hee *make himſelfe wiſe above that which is written, and obtrude upon the conſciences of thoſe that joyne with him, an inſtitution of his own, in the Name of an Ordinance and Inſtitution of God*, when hee undertakes to determine Infants particularly to be the ſubject of Baptiſme, and Sprinkling in the Name of Father, Sonne, and Holy Ghoſt, to be the manner of Adminiſtration, and accordingly practiſe the ſame?

XXXI. *Querie Anſwered.*

1. Though it ſhould be granted, *That many, if not the generality of thoſe that have entred into the way of new Baptiſme* (as the Querift miſcalls it, it being indeed the old way of Baptizing) *Have received their precious Faith, and other Graces, under the diſpenſation of their Infant-Baptiſme*, yet this would be no more a reaſon obliging their continuance in their old wonted forme, (ſuppoſing there is yet a more excellent way) then it was or would have beene to thoſe who were wrought upon in a ſaving way, under the Popiſh, and after that the prelaticall forme, to have continued ſtill their abode in their Tents.

2. It is like no good uſe would be made of it by ſome, ſhould I become ſo much a foole, as to glory of what I aſſuredly know,

touch-

touching the Spiritual increase which God hath vouchsafed many of his servants under this Dispensation. But this I may say, that more *then one of a thousand* (though I believe the Querist does not know one of a thousand of them, and therefore can be no competent Judge of the growth of their thousands; but that more then one of a thousand) *ingaged in this new, Alias* old *way* of which the Querist speakes, *have since their entrance into it, added much more then the breadth of the least haire of their head unto their former growth or stature in Christ*, is a truth, of which the Querist would make no doubt at all, as now hee does, had hee but taken their former, and present Spirituall Dimensions, with such a measuring Reed as that wherewith *John* did *measure the Temple of God, and them that worship therein, Rom.* 11.1. But however, it is good for every Man *to thinke soberly* (as the Apostle speakes in an other case) both in commending, and discommending, and *not to stretch himself beyond his own line in measuring.*

3. To the *Querists* further demand, I answer; that possibly some may be worse since they came under this Dispensation then before, though I must say I know not one such, except such who have quite forsaken the way, and it is no marvell if they are grown worse: nay this rather turnes to a Testimony for that way, then against it, in that when Men grow bad, the yoke of Christ becomes too strait for them any longer to weare, and the company too holy for them to indure. But as for the decayes of some in the way, if it strengthen not its claime as to be from God, so neither does it at all weaken it any more, then those unruly and disorderly walkings of some in the Apostolicall Churches, did argue the way of those Churches not to be of God. Alas if such pleas as these were valid, where are there Men of that order and forme, that could avouch their way to be of God? But if the old way of Independency be indeed free from all spots of this kinde, they shall by my consent, *throw the first stone* at the Men of this new way. Well may this way of managing the controversie between us, occasion indeed those *evill surmisings, alienation of affection, and vilifyings*, of which the Querist speakes. & 14 but will contribute little towards the finding out the truth, but rather the contrary, upon which account

I shall forbeare what otherwise might have beene retorted.

XXXII. *Quaere answered.*

What the Learning, Worth, and Humility was, of *Johannes Oecolampadius*, *Johannes Denkius*, and *Johannes Gaster*, in *Luthers* time, I know not, who as the Querist informes us, *repented of their weaknesse*, as having beene *surprized* with a *religious conceit* of the necessity of new, *alias* old Baptisme: But this I know, that it is a very rare thing for men of such great learning, as these are represented to have been, meerly by a surprisall with a Religious conceit, so farre to deny themselves of the accommodations of their former way, wherein they inherited the respects of Men, and the warme influences of the World, as to expose themselves to the hatred, opposition, and persecution of the times, except their convictions from the Word of God, have been very potent and operative upon the Conscience. And whether these men did returne back to their former form, accompanied with the same humility and worth, with which before they left it, is more then I know, or then the Querist does informe us in, or then I am bound to believe, since learned men (as experience of all Ages shewes,) have been no more temptation-proofe, and free from backsliding to imbrace this present World, then other Men.

But as for those of late among our selves of like Character, except it be such as have repented of their worth and humility, as well as of their new Baptisme; as the Querist does not name any, so I have not known or heard of any, except one or two Ministers, who have repented for a good living sake, (as possibly those other learned men might doe) and yet I am given to understand, that one of those hath againe repented of that his Repentance.

XXXIII. *Quaere answered.*

Here the Querist supposes, that Baptisme is no more the Baptisme of Repentance for the Remission of sins, then Circumcision was the Circumcision of Repentance for Remission of sins, or at least, that the one may be truly so called as well as the other; and that therefore, though Infants cannot repent, that yet they are no lesse capable of Baptism, then they were of Circumcision.

But

But I deny that which the Querist supposeth, viz. that Circumcision might as well and truly be called the Circumcision of Repentance as Baptism, the Baptism of Repentance.

1. Because his reason upon which hee builds his Supposition is unsound, being this, viz. because according to the Apostles definition of Circumcision, *Rom.* 4. 11. *it is for substance and import of matter, the same with Baptisme.* But that neither Circumcision and Baptisme, are for import of matter the same, nor yet that *Rom* 4. 11. does import any such thing, is that the demonstration whereof I have briefly alleged in answering the 23. Querie, where the same thing was alleadged by the Querist, to which I refer the Reader.

2. If well observed, it will appeare, that the reason why Baptisme is called the Baptisme of Repentance for Remission of sins, is such as would by no means suite with such a denomination of Circumcision, and consequently that Children are not as capable of Baptisme, as they were of Circumcision. For the reason why *Johns* Baptisme was called the *Baptisme of Repentance for Remission of sins*, as in the place quoted by the Querist *Mark.* 1. 4. was, because Repentance was the qualifying terme upon which *John* preached Baptisme as meete to be received, and upon which those received it accordingly that were Baptised by him. As the Covenant given *Abraham* is called *the Covenant of Circumcision*, *Acts* 7. 8. because probably Circumcision was the tearm by and according to which the seed of *Abraham* were to be adjudged in the Covenant, and rightfull partakers of the benefits and privileges of it, and therefore called the *token between God and them*, of his being in Covenant with them, and they with him, *Gen.* 17. 11. and the uncircumcised of *Abrahams* Seed are said to have *broken the Covenant*, Ver. 14 *or broken it dotn, or made it frustrate*, as *Ainsworth* renders it, *i. e.* dissolved the terms or conditions of it; upon which account God would have them *cut off from his people, i.e.* at least excluded the priviledges of those that kept his Covenant by making good the condition on their parts. But that repentance was the qualifying term of *Johns* Baptisme, as Circumcision was visibly the qualifying term of Gods Covenant, appeares both by *Johns* Preaching, and the peoples receiving of Baptisme: By *Johns* preaching; for its said that he *Preached the*

Baptisme of Repentance, Luke 3.3. Acts 13 24. Now what was it for him to preach the Baptisme of Repentance, but to preach that men ought to repent, and so to be Baptized? Which that it was, also appears in that those that did receive Baptisme from him according to his preaching, did professe Repentance; for its said, *they were Baptized of* John *in* Jordan, *confessing their sins*, Mat.3.6. *Mar.*1.5. But the Pharisees *who trusted in themselves that they were righteous*, and *justified themselves* Luke 16.15. & 18. 9 11. though many of them came to *Johns* Baptisme, *Mat.* 3.7. yet it seems, disowning the terms on which it was to be administred, *viz.* repentance for remission of sinnes, they are said to have *rejected* (or made frustrate, as the word is) *the Counsell of God against themselves, not being Baptized of him.* Luk 7.30.

But because the right understanding of the carriage of things here about in the very beginning of this Ministration of Baptism, is of great use by which to judge how it ought to be used now, the Ministration remayning still, though the first Ministrators are dead, Therefore I shall desire these two things may be well minded.

1. That *Johns* Ministry by Preaching and Baptizing, was that from which the Gospell Ministration began to take its rise or beginning, and which began that great turne which was made in the World by abolishing the legall way of Worship and Ordinances, and of bringing in the Evangelicall. Hereupon its said; *The Law and the Prophets were till* John, *since that time the Kingdome of God* (i.e. the new and Gospell state) *is Preached, and every Man presseth into it.* Therefore also is the Ministration of *John* called *the beginning of the Gospell of Jesus Christ the Sonne of God. Mark* 1.1, 2. By the way then, if God was pleased to honour the Ordinance of Baptisme with the ushering in of the Gospell Ministration into the World, and to cause it thus to march in the front when he brought his first begotten into the World, had not they need to consider whether they doe it right or no, who cause it to march in the Reare of all the things of the Gospell, in their Opinions of it, and affections to it?

2. That as Baptisme (except it were *Johns* Preaching) was the first Gospell Ordinance by which the change began, so the terms of the Administration and Reception of this Ordinance now

varied

varied from the termes of the administration and reception of Ordinances under the Law, as well as the Ordinance it self varied from those. That which gave men right and title to the Ordinances of the Law, Circumcision and the rest, was *their having Abraham to their Father*: That which now gave men right to *John's* Baptisme, was not this, but their repentance; and this *John* sufficiently signifies *Mat.* 3.8,9. *Luke* 3.9. when in his preaching to the people that came to his Baptisme, especially the Pharisees, he said, *Thinke not to say within your selves, we have* Abraham *to our Father*, but bring forth fruits meet for repentance: as if he should have said, Doe not think that plea will now serve your turne to render you capable of this Gospel-Ordinance, *viz.* that you have *Abraham* to your Father, though it hath served your turne heretofore as to your participation in Mosaicall dispensations, but now if you will be baptised indeed, and enter upon the Gospel-worship, then bring forth fruits meet for, or becomming repentance. Whereupon we shall finde that he did instruct them how they shou'd live for the time to come, as well as to repent of, and confesse their sinnes that were past, *Luke* 3.10,11,12,13,14.

And now if Baptisme were called the Baptism of Repentance, because none but repentant persons, or such as so professed themselves to be, were to partake thereof, then I am sure there is neither the same reason why Circumcision might be truly called the Circumcision of Repentance, nor yet that Infants are as duly capable of the Baptisme of Repentance, as they were of Circumcision.

XXXIV. *Quæria answered.*

1. Whether those words *Acts* 2.38. 39. *Repent and be baptised every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sinnes, and ye shall receive the gift of the holy Ghost; for the promise is to you, and to your children, and to all that are a farre off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call*; I say, whether these words did so much enjoyne those to whom spoken, to repent, in order to their being baptised, as encourage them both unto the one duty, and the other, upon account of the promise relating to them, I shall not need to determine: But surely the Quærist does not thinke but that their Repentance was enjoyned in order to their being

baptiſed as well as for other cauſes; unleſſe he will ſay, they were to be baptiſed firſt, and then to repent after, according to his own Method of baptiſing children.

2. If the Parents Title to the Promiſe was a ground or motive unto them to be baptiſed, but not be baptiſed without Repentance, but both to repent and to be baptiſed, as the Querift himſelfe ſuppoſes it was; then why ſhould the Promiſe be any more a ground to the children to be baptiſed without repentance, then it was to the Parents? or how, or by what paſſage, word, or ſyllable in the Text, does the Querift diſcerne, that the Promiſe was made upon any other termes to the Children, then it was to the Parents?

3. Is it not moſt apparent, that the whole tenor of the Promiſe here made, in reſpect of the perſons to whom it is made (expreſſed in theſe words, *you, your children, and all a far off*) is governed and limited by that laſt clauſe of the 39. ver. *even as many as the Lord our God ſhall call?* If ſo, then the Promiſe did belong unto the children no otherwiſe then to the parents, nor had they any intereſt in the promiſe of remiſſion of ſinne, of gift of the holy Ghoſt untill called by Repentance and Baptiſme, the terms here propoſed, to render them capable of it, no more then their parents had.

4. If we conſider what the Promiſe is which is here ſaid, to be made to them and to their children, it will evidently appeare, that it, *i.e.* the good promiſed, belongs to none but repenting perſons † and conſquently not to Infants: and if the Promiſe did not belong to Infants as Infants, then no Baptiſme upon account of the Promiſe. The things here promiſed, are the remiſſion of ſinnes, and gift of the holy Ghoſt: for thoſe are the things the Apoſtle does aſcertaine them by the Promiſe.

† The Promiſe in a ſenſe is made to all the world, that is the publication and offer of it. Mark 16. 15. but Baptiſme doth not here.

upon belong to all the world, but only to ſuch as doe believe the Promiſe: Faith being the condition of the good promiſed, Baptiſme is made by God, to be as an Appendix to that condition: Go preach the Goſpell to every creature, i.e. offer them Salvation by Jeſus Chriſt: but upon what termes ſhall they receive this Salvation offered? Theſe, [He that believeth and is baptized, ſhall be ſaved:] ſo that Baptiſme comes in upon the promiſe imbraced, not upon the offer of the promiſe. Now when Peter ſayes, the promiſe is made to you and your children, the meaning is, that the offer and tender of Salvation did belong unto them and their children, and to all a far off, and the good of it to as many as God ſhould call. Though there be in Scripture ſeveral Diſcoveries of the gracious councell of God concerning little children, yet where ever any termes of grace and ſalvation are offered, or promiſed, upon the taking place of ſomething to be believed, or done by the creature, there the Promiſe, or Offer of Grace, is alwayes to be underſtood to reſpect, not Infants, but perſons having the uſe and exerciſe of their reaſon and underſtanding, Deut. 11. 1, 2. Mark 4. 9. 23.

Now

Now this Promiſe of remiſſion of Sinnes and gift of the holy Ghoſt, is either abſolute and without condition, or elſe it is only conditionall; for betweene theſe there is no mean. If abſolute, then the remiſſion of Sinnes and gift of the holy Ghoſt were promiſed to all the Jewes, and their children, without any condition at all, whether they did repent and were baptiſed or no; but this I think no man will affirme. If the Promiſe then was conditionall, as you ſee it muſt needs be, then none had right to the Promiſe, that is to the things promiſed, but thoſe that had performed the condition, for take away the condition of the Obligation or Promiſe, and the Obligation ceaſes to be: now the condition of the Promiſe is here clearly ſet by the Apoſtle to be, if not Repentance and a being baptiſed in the name of Jeſus Chriſt (for if any knowes how upon good ground to divide them herein, let it ſo be) yet I am ſure Repentance is: *Repent and be baptiſed*, &c. *and ye ſhall receive*, &c. that is, and thereupon ye ſhall receive, &c. And if Repentance was the condition of the Promiſe here mentioned by the Apoſtle, then I am ſure the children of theſe Jewes could no more have right to the Promiſe here made untill they did repent, then the parents themſelves could, and conſequently no more right to Baptiſme upon account of the Promiſe, then they had.

Which thing is ſo evident and cleare, that I ſhall wonder if any rationall man ſhall not diſcerne it, if he will but give his reaſon and judgement full ſcope to conſider it.

XXXV. *Queries anſwered.*

Here the Queriſt demands, *Whether God doth ſmell in the aſſemblies of thoſe*, which he ſayes *judge themſelves the only duly baptiſed perſons under heaven, with any ſuch pleaſure or delight, as he ſmelleth many the Aſſemblies of thoſe who are called unbaptiſed? or are they filled with the glory and preſence of God at ſuch a rate? or are there any ſuch manifeſtations of the ſpirit there? or are the powers of the World to come, ſo active and buſie in the Church meetings of the one, as they are in the other?*

Had the Queriſt given us to underſtand in what reſpects he ſpeaks theſe things, and by what he makes judgement, when, and when not, ſuch appearances of God as he ſpeakes of, are vouchſa-

fed

fed men in their Aſſemblies, we might have knowne the better how to have ſatisfied his demand. If he judge of the preſence of God, and the activity of the powers of the world to come in this caſe, by thoſe effects which the miniſtration of the Goſpel in ſuch or ſuch Aſſemblies works in men, in cauſing them to deny themſelves in their worldly intereſt, not ſeeking the great things of this world, but being content to loſe the favour and reſpect of men, the love of relations, and to expoſe themſelves to the cenſures, hard thoughts, evill ſpeakings, reproachings, revilings, ſcoffings, laughings, and oppoſitions of men, that they might approve themſelves faithfull to God; and likewiſe in cauſing them to ſeek the honour of God, and good of Men, in diſpenſing the Goſpel freely, and perſwading all to a cloſe and intire conformity thereto, both in their drawings nigh to God in the matters of his houſe and worſhip, and in their deportment and carriage towards men in common converſation; I ſay, if judgement ſhall be made of the preſence of God with his people by ſuch effects as theſe, which yet were the great tokens of the preſence of his grace in the firſt times of the Goſpel, then doubtleſſe the Queriſt needed not to have made a queſtion of it, where theſe are moſt viſible. Or if he will eſtimate the preſence of God we ſpeak of, by thoſe glorious ſucceſſes which he is pleaſed to give unto the meetings, Miniſtery, and endeavours of his Servants in bringing in great numbers and multitudes both of men and women, to be obedient to the Faith, according to the Doctrine and Order of the Goſpel, then I ſhall deſire him to caſt his eyes abroad in the Land, and then tell us, by whoſe hands the greateſt part of thoſe many Churches that are ſeparated from the nationall way, have been planted, eſpecially in thoſe places, where not long ſince, ſcarce ſo much as a face of Religion was to be ſeene.

As concerning many of thoſe of whom ſuch Churches do conſiſt; it is very true that *that* which our Saviour ſpeaks of the Miniſtry of the Prophets diſpoſing and preparing a People for the hands of the Apoſtles, and for that Goſpel-mould into which they were to caſt them, may aptly enough be applyed to the Miniſtry of the Baptiſts in planting and building of Churches of ſuch materialls, as were in part prepared to their hands. John 4.37,38. *Herein is that ſaying true, One ſoweth, & another reapeth; I ſent you to*

reap

reap that wherein ye bestowed no labour: Other men laboured, and ye are entred into their labour. But the Lord hath been pleased not onely to use them as his workmen to polish some living stones which were in part hewne before, and for the building them up into spirituall houses, putting them into the right order and way of worshipping God, perfecting as to this, that which was lacking before, but hath also so wonderfully prospered his word in their mouthes, *in turning of men from darknesse to light, and from the power of Satan unto God*, in severall the dark places of this Nation, that I confesse I have not heard of the like testimony given by God to the endeavours of any other sort of men in these dayes: and surely such things as these, were wont to be accounted signes of the presence of the Lord with his people, *Acts* 11.21. *And the hand of the Lord was with them; and a great number believed, and turned to the Lord.* Neither can it reasonably be thought, that *the Scriptures are as a sealed Booke among these Men* whilst such effects are produced by their opening and pressing of them: Well may it be indeed that the Scriptures are not dished and carved out by these men, with such straines of humane Art and Oratory as they may be by some others; but we know who it was, who though hee had as himselfe sayes, Tongues more then many others, yet did decline the *perswasible words of Mens Wisdome* in his Preaching the Gospell to men, *lest their faith should have stood in the Wisdome of men, and not in the Power of God*, 1 *Cor.*2.4,5. And I am sure that may be truly said in the vindication of these, which *Paul* was faine sometimes to speake in his own vindication when disparaged by some of the slanting Preachers of those Times, *viz. But though I be rude in* 2 Cor.11.6. *Speech, yet not in Knowledge.* I should not have mentioned any thing of this nature, but that there was a kinde of necessity for it, but if I have plaid the foole in this confident boasting, as the Apostle speakes, you know who hath compelled me to it.

XXXVI. *Querie answered.*

Here I confesse I cannot but wonder at the over-sight of the *Querist*, in that he brings *Mark*.6.44. *John* 6.10. compared with *Mat.*14.21. to prove *that both Women and Children are to be understood, when men onely are named*, when as indeed his quotations

ſerve to prove the quite contrary. For whereas *Marke* and *John* in the places before mentioned, report the men that did eate of the five Loaves and two fiſhes, to be about five thouſand men; *Mathew* hee reports the perſons eating hereof to be about five thouſand men, *beſides Women and Children*. So that *Mark* and *John* take notice onely of the number of the men in their relation of the Miracle, whereas *Mathew* though he does exactly agree with them as touching the ſame number of men, yet he intimates that there were Women and Children that did eate, beſides the five thouſand men. By which it evidently appeares, that though Women and Children were joyned with the men in the ſame action, yet that where *John* and *Marke* mention the men onely, the Women and Children are not to be underſtood as comprehended in that number, which as I ſay is the contrary to that for the proofe whereof thoſe Texts were alledged. And therefore this is ſo farre from being any ground to conceive that Childrens being Baptized, is meant when Men and Womens onely is mentioned, as that it is a ground to conceive the contrary.

XXXVII. *Querie anſwered.*

Here the *Queriſt* ſuppoſes that though it ſhould be proved that there were no Children Baptized during the Apoſtles dayes, that yet it would no more follow from thence that Children ought not to be Baptized now, then it would have followed, that becauſe the *Iſraelites* omitted to circumciſe their Children for forty yeares, *Joſh.* 5. that therefore it was not lawfull for them to Circumciſe them afterwards. To which I anſwer, that it is granted, that the one would no more follow then the other, if there were a like command for the one as there was for the other. And therefore I marvell that the *Queriſt* ſhould ſo contrary to this, in other *Queries*, argue the non-neceſſity of a mans being Baptized, if he have but paſſed the time of his *firſt entrance upon the profeſſion of Chriſt*, as he does *Qu.* 22. But why the *Queriſt* ſhould ſuppoſe that the Baptizing of Children now, ſhould be more neceſſary then it was in the Apoſtles dayes, I know not, neither does he (nor as I believe can he) give us any account.

Something indeed hee alledges as a reaſon ſuch as it is, why poſſibly

possibly Christ & the Apostles might omit the Baptizing of Children in their time, though otherwise lawfull, and that which they had been bound to doe, had not such a reason interposed, and it is this, *viz.* Because *Paul* sayd, *I was not sent to Baptize, but to Preach the Gospell*: meaning, as hee expounds this saying, that *Baptizing was not onely not the Principall, but not any considerable end of his sending, but the publishing of the Gospell.* Which reason he further amplifies thus: *If he were not sent to Baptize neither one age, nor one Sex or other, neither could he be sent to Baptize Children, and if not hee, then neither Christ nor the rest of the Apostles, in the sence declared; and then what marvell if whilst sent about matters incomparably greater, they should not be so intent upon things of a secondary and lighter consequence as to persecute them to the uttermost of what they lawfully might.* To all which I answer,

1. I cannot consent to the interpretation which the *Quæriſt* gives of those words, *Christ sent me not to Baptize &c.* When he thereby would have us understand, that for *Paul* to Baptize, was no considerable end of his being sent of Christ, if by Baptizing we understand Baptizing either in his own person or by seeing it done by some other hands; Which latitude notwithstanding the *Quæriſt* allowes. For there is no doubt but that for him to cause Baptisme to be administred to men when they did believe, was a considerable end of the Apostles sending, as well as his preaching the Gospell that men might beleeve, and therefore they are joyned in the Commission thus: *goe yee therefore teach all Nations, Baptizing them, &c.* When therefore he sayes, *Christ sent him not to Baptize*, doubtlesse hee means, that the injunction did not lie upon him so much to administer Baptisme with his owne hands (for that is the thing of which hee was speaking) as to Preach the Gospell, because that being a worke that might be done by an ordinary Disciple, hee was not otherwise obliged in that case but to take care that it should be done, if not by himselfe, yet by some other, *Acts* 10. 48. *Peter commanded them to be Baptized in the Name of the Lord*: possibly by such assistants as the Apostles were wont to take with them, and not unlike for that very purpose as well as for other causes, *Acts* 13. 5. & 15. 38. Just as it was in the case of Ministering to the poore; it lay upon the Apostles, as the care of all the Churches did, to take

care that Deacons ſhould be choſen for that worke, but that they ſhould be burdened with a perſonall attendance upon that ſervice (though ſometimes they undertooke it) ſeemed to them an unreaſonable thing, ſeeing they had other worke to attend which could not ſo well be done by other hands as that might, *Acts* 6. 2,3 4 But if Baptiſme had been ſo inconſiderable a buſineſſe, and ſo little concerning the Apoſtles to take care of, as this reaſon of the *Queriſt* imports, one would thinke they ſhould not have made ſuch haſt as *Paul* and *Silas* did to Baptize the Jaylor and his houſe, not only the ſame houre of the night, but even whilſt thoſe cutting laſhes and ſtripes which they had newly received, were freſh upon them. Nor would *Ananias* have haſtened *Paul* as he did to be Baptized before he did eate or drinke, when as he had now faſted three dayes, *Acts* 9.9.18,19 & 22. 16. Surely if the like caſe ſhould fall out in our dayes, we would ſay *God will have Mercy and not Sacrifice.*

2. That the Baptizing of Children was not ſo neceſſary in the Apoſtles dayes, but that the Apoſtles did defer the Baptizing of them if not ſo long as the *Iſraelites* did defer Circumciſion, *Joſh.* 5. yet that they did defer it till they came to give account of their Faith I willingly grant; but that they did ſo long ſuſpend the Baptizing of men after they beleeved, I cannot beleeve, becauſe I finde the contrary: and yet if you obſerve, the reaſon is no otherwiſe a reaſon why though if Childrens Baptiſme had beene lawfull, the practice of it might have beene forborne in the Apoſtles dayes, then that the Baptizing of Beleevers themſelves might have beene forborne, and yet it ſeemes that could not be forborne upon any ſuch pretence. For can wee lightly imagine that the Apoſtles hands ſhould at any time be fuller of worke, then when they had thoſe many thouſands before them, and ſuch an advantagious opportunity of Preaching the Goſpell as then preſented it ſelfe, *Acts* 2. and therefore if they might have uſed ſuch a liberty of deferring Baptiſme as the *Queriſt* imagines, upon account of more important affaires lying upon their ſhoulders, why ſhould they have put themſelves upon any ſuch ſtraits, as to Baptize three thouſand the ſame day they converted them? Doubtleſſe the opportunities of many weekes would have beene little enough according to the zeale of our Age, eſpecially if

Baptiſme

Baptiſme be thought ſo inconſiderable a thing as to be done by leiſure.

3. If the Baptizing of Infants had been any part of the Will of God or of his inſtitutions in the Apoſtles dayes, I cannot ſo eaſily thinke, but that the Apoſtles notwithſtanding their more weighty affaires, would in ſome time of their lives or other have found time and opportunity of fulfilling that parte of righteouſneſſe as well as others, or how ever, would have enjoyned others this practice, or elſe ſurely they would not have anſwered the Commiſſion of their Maſter, whoſe injunction was, that they ſhould teach the Beleevers to obſerve whatſoever hee had commanded them, *Mat.* 28.20.

And therefore to what purpoſe is there in this caſe, mention made of thoſe caſes wherein a man may breake a Law and yet be blameleſſe? or will any of thoſe Scripture inſtances the *Queriſt* points to, agree any better with the caſe in hand, then haſpe and harrow? The Prieſts in the Temple killed Beaſts for Sacrifice on the Sabbath becauſe commanded, which otherwiſe had not been lawfull, *Ergo*; The Apoſtles might lawfully forbeare Baptizing all their dayes though a duty commanded, having other worke to doe of greater moment, though they had opportunity of doing both this and that. The Diſciples plucked Eares of Corne on the Sabbath, and *David* did eat the ſhew bread in caſe of neceſſity to ſuſtein hunger and ſave life, *Ergo*, Chriſt and the Apoſtles might omit Baptizing all their time, though they had no ſuch neceſſity of other ingagements upon them, but that they might either doe it themſelves or command it to be done by others; unleſſe wee will ſuppoſe they had not time and leaſure to give out ſuch a command where they came, which yet we find they ſometimes did *Acts* 10.48. *John* 4.2. as they did alſo in other caſes, in appointing that to be done by others, which they could not ſo well attend themſelves, *Tit.* 1.5. Mat. 12. 3, 4, 5.

Without peradventure, the miſunderſtanding the Apoſtles intendment in that expreſſion of his, *Chriſt ſent me not to Baptize, but to Preach the Goſpell*, hath proved a ſnare to many in theſe dayes, to thinke more meanly of the Ordinance of Baptiſme, then ever the Apoſtle thought. For doubtleſſe it was not the Apoſtles drift in thoſe words to bring downe the eſteeme of baptiſme

and to magnifie Preaching, but partly to shew how little reason any had to glory in that they had been Baptized by his hands rather then by such and such; but more especially to satisfie them as touching the reason why though he converted all or most of them to the Faith, as 1 *Cor.* 4 15. that yet he himselfe Baptized so few of them as he had said, 1 *Cor.* 1. 14. 16. and his reason is not fetched from the non-necessity of Baptisme (for wee shall finde that he tooke care to have them Baptized presently upon their beleeving, *Acts* 18.8.) but from the non-necessity of having it dispenced by his hands: and he further gives this account why he did not Baptise them himselfe, but set others to doe it, not because he wanted time and opportunity to doe it, *but lest any should say that he Baptized in his own Name.*

XXXVIII. *Querie answered.*

1. Whether the *Principle of the Children of new, alias* old Baptisme, which puts them upon Baptizing, beleevers as the Apostles did, be a *By-Way*, or the Principle of the men of old *alias* new Baptisme, which puts them upon Baptizing Children, be the *By way*, let the Scriptures judge, or at least be the Rule to judge by: there I am sure the Children the Querists speakes of, find that practiced which answers their Principle; if the Querist and the Brethren of his way, cannot finde theirs there too, but onely fancy to themselves they can fetch it about with a long Arme, let them looke to it, lest their way doe not prove at last a *By-way*, and in the meane time that which leads them into many other By wayes, By-thoughts, By-sayings, which will be found too light in the ballance of the Gospell, and which will turne to no good account in the day when God shall *try every mans work of what sort it is*, 1 Cor. 3. 13.

2. As for counting all persons not of our way, uncleane and unholy, I have already accounted with the Querist in some other Queries for those expressions, and have shewed him how he hath miscast the reckoning: I would faine have him to know that we can call and count some of mens wayes and practises unclean and unholy, and yet not so judge of their persons as to a totall uncleannesse. Doe we not know that *Asa* and *Jehosophat* were Servants of the Lord in their times, and did approve themselves

to

to a good degree of uprightneſſe towards God in *taking away the high places and the groves of the Idols*, 2 Chron. 14.5. and 17.6. and yet for all that, were to blame, and it is left on record as their blemiſh, that they did not alſo take away the *high places* which the people had erected for the worſhip of the true God, to ſave themſelves the labour of going to *Jeruſalem*, the place which God had choſen to place his Name in, whither they ought to have gone, *Deut.* 12.5. In like manner we doe acknowledge that ye have well done, and doubt not but God hath taken it well at your hands, in that ye have advanced to that degree of Reformation at which ye have arived; but I muſt needs ſay, it yet remaines a blemiſh upon you, that you ſuffer amongſt you any of thoſe wayes which men have formerly deviſed to make the way of the Goſpel more eaſie and plauſible, as to the fleſh, then Chriſt hath made it; and theſe blots are ſo eſſentiall to Communion, as that we know not how *to eat of your Sacrifice, and not be partakers of your Altar*, i.e. to hold Church-communion with you, and not make our ſelves guilty of that which we condemne in the way of your Communion. 1 Chron. 15.17. & 10.33.

2. As for the crime laid to the charge of this *humour* (as our friend is pleaſed to call it) of the Baptiſts, *viz. the breaking the Bonds of Unity, Love, and Peace, by which they were bound up with other Churches before*, it is nothing but what the Proteſtant Biſhops underwent from the Papiſts when they went off from them; and the Presbyterians from the Prelates; and the Independents from the Presbyterians, when they ſeparated themſelves from them: and therefore I hope no wiſe man will be much ſtartled with ſuch ſcare-crowes as theſe, in his eying a worke of Reformation, or think the worſe of the baptiſmall way, becauſe it carryes men yet a little further in reforming, upon which account they are conſtrained to leave their friends behind, that will not go with them, as they themſelves alſo have done thoſe from whom they have departed.

3. But as for *eſtimating Chriſtianity it ſelfe, and acceptance with God* by this deſpiſed way of Baptiſme, ſurely if any doe eſtimate Chriſtianity by this onely (for otherwiſe I hope it may beare its part, and ſignifie its number in the reckoning as well as other Chriſtian duties) they are much to blame; but that the Queriſt

did

did ever know, or hath ground to believe that any the men he ſpeaks of, much leſſe all, have or do make ſuch an eſtimation, I cannot eaſily conceive; ſure I am ſuch a thing is far from their frequent Declaration of themſelves as to this particular: and therefore how duly or unduly, the Queriſt hath coupled theſe poore Baptiſts with men of ſuch unworthy ſtraines and tempers, as thoſe are repreſented to be with whom they are compared, and into whoſe company he hath put them (for what cauſe he beſt knowes) we muſt leave to God and ſober men to judge.

XXXIX. *Querie anſwered.*

1. That Mr. *Philpot* ſpake or wrote, as he thought, in affirming *Auxentius* an *Arrian* to be the firſt, and *Pelagius* the ſecond, *that rejected the Baptiſme of Children*, I will not deny, but that he had any good ground ſo to think or ſo to ſay, is that which I do deny: for as Mr. *Philpot* did not ſpeak this of his own knowledge, ſo neither could any Author whom he muſt credit herein, be able to affirme any ſuch thing, unleſſe he had been more then a man, and had knowne what, and when every man in the world that diſcourſed theſe things, had affirmed or denyed concerning them. Beſides, were not Authors of Bookes in former times, at leaſt ſome of them, men of like infirmity with ſeverall in theſe times, who have written and affirmed things of the Independents themſelves, not ſo much out of knowledge and judgement, as out of diſaffection? if ſo; are not, or may not they be abuſed or miſguided in their apprehenſions, that take all hiſtoricall relations and repreſentations concerning the Anabaptiſts (falſly ſo called) for truth, as well as they are, and are like to be, who accordingly do, or ſhall credit all that is written of the Independents, by men diſaffected to their way? Beſides, what credit can be given to ancient Authors hereabout, when many ancient Bookes are acknowledged to be ſpurious, and others to be corrupted by the Papiſts, who have put in, and put out, (in their long reign of darkneſſe) what would beſt ſerve their intereſt.

And that which is yet more conſiderable, is, that if it ſhould appeare by unqueſtionable Hiſtory (which for ought I could ever learne does not, but the contrary) that the baptiſing of Children had been practiſed in the next age after the Apoſtles, yet unleſſe it

it could be made appeare that it was practised by approbation of the Apostles in the Apostles times, or that by some injunction it ought so to have been, it would not at all be any ground to warrant such a practise now, because as the *mystery of iniquity did begin to work* in the Apostles dayes, so there was a departing in part from the purity and simplicity of the Gospel, and an introducing of the inventions of men, whilest it was yet but early. *I know*, saith Paul, *that after my departing, shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flocke, also of your owne selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away Disciples after them*, Act. 20. 29. 30.

But 2. If the Querist thinks Mr. *Philpot* is worthy of credit in his foresaid report, though he produce no Authors, may not the Authors of a Book, entituled *A very plaine and well grounded Treatise concerning Baptisme*, be rather credited in their allegation of Authors that assert the contrary to Mr. *Philpot*? Amongst very many Authors which they produce on this account, I shall instance in some few.

In pag. 19. of the said Book thus:

Tertullian in Libro de Baptismo: That Infants or young Children should not be so speedily baptised: and upon the saying of the Lord; *Suffer little Children to come unto me and forbid them not*: he speaketh thus, *Let them come when they are growne, and are able to be instructed*: when they can learne to know Christ, then may they be Christians. For if youth be not so hastily to be put in trust with earthly goods, why with heavenly? Let them therefore know first how to desire that which is for their good, to the intent that it being desired, it may be given them.

And now I doubt not but the Querist well knowes, that *Tertullian* lived long before *Anxentius* and *Pelagius* had a being in world, and therefore by this it will appeare, that Mr. *Philpot* was not worthy of credit in reporting them to be the first that denyed the baptising of Children.

Page 28. *Erasmus in annotationibus supra*, 5. *cap. ad Rom.* Baptising of young Children was not as yet in use by S. *Pauls* time. *Roffensis contra cap. Babylon.* The first Rulers in their Church have used such manner of baptisme, as Christ never used in his Church. Dr. *Eckius* against the new Church orders in the upper Marquis-

dom and Territories of *Norenburg*, writeth; That the ordinances concerning the baptism of children, is without Scripture, and is found to be onely a custom of the Church.

Page 30. *Bucerus in his book intituled the ground-work and cause, &c.* In the Congregation of God, confession of sins is alwayes the first, the which in times past went before baptism, for commonly children were baptized when they came to their understanding. And again, in the beginning of the Church, no man was baptized & received into the congregation, but those that through hearing the word, wholly gave over and submitted themselves to Christ. And again, *in annotationibus super 4. Iohn.* So much as in the Apostollicall writings are written of baptism is apparent that Baptism was Administred to none by the Apostles, but those of whom they (concerning their regeneration) made no doubt.

Page 21. *Cassander in libello de Infantium Baptismo?* It is certain that some believers in time past, have withholden baptisme from their children untill they were grown, and could understand and remember the misteries of their faith; yea also counselled not to administer baptism, as by *Tertullian* and *Gregory Nazianzen* appeareth.

In same Page. *Zwinglius in his Book of Articles, Artic.* 18. In the old time, children were openly instructed, who when they came to understand, were called *Catechumeni, i.e.* such as are instructed in the word of salvation; and when they had imprinted the faith in their Hearts, and made Confession thereof with their Mouthes, they were admitted to Baptisme.

Page 25. *Lodovicus vives in Augustinum de civetate dei. Lib.* 1. *Cap.* 26. No man in times past was brought to be baptized, but those who were come to their full growth, who having learned what it concerned, of their own accord desired the same.

Page 31. *Luther* in his book of *Annabaptisme* acknowledgeth, that it cannot be proved by sacred Scripture, that Childrens baptism was instituted by Christ, or begun by the first Christians after the Apostles. Page 20. *Rupertus Tuitiensis lib.* 4 *de divinis officiis cap.* 18. In former times, the custom in the Primitive Church was, that they administred not the Sacrament of Regeneration, but only at the feast of *Easter* and *Pentecost*, and all the children of the Church which throughout the whole yeare, through the word

were

were *MOVED*, when *Easter* came, gave up their names, and were the following dayes till *Penticost*, instructed in the rules of Faith, rehearsed the same by their baptism, and dying thus with Christ, rose again with him.

Page 15. *Justin Martyr in oratione ad Anthoninum Pium*: I will declare unto you, how we offer up our selves to God, after that we are renewed through Christ. Those amongst us that are instructed in the faith and believe that which we teach them is true, being willing to live according to the same, we do admonish to fast and pray for the forgivenesse of their sins, and we also fast and pray with them; And when they are brought by us unto the water, and there as we were new born, are they also by new birth renewed: And then in calling upon God the Father, the *Lord Iesus Christ*, and the holy Ghost, they are washed in water. Note that this Author is one of the first extant after the Apostles dayes.

Take also a few instances of such who though borne of Christian Parents, yet were not baptized till instructed in the Faith.

Page 16. *Erasmus* and *Wicleuius in vita Hieronomi ex ipsis Scriptis collecta Hieronimus*, borne in the City *Sydon*, of Christian Parents, and brought up in the Christian Religion, was baptized at *Rome* in the 30 yeare of his age. Also, *Paulinus de vita Ambrosij & Nauclerus Chron. Gener.* 13. *Ambrosius* borne of Christian Parents, his Fathers Name was *Ambrosius*, and his Mothers Name *Marcelina*, remained instructed in the faith unbaptized till he was chosen Bishop of *Millain*, at which time he received Baptism of a Catholick Priest.

Likewise *Nauclerus Generat.* 14. *Anno Dom.* 391. *Augustinus* the Son of the vertuous *Monica*, being instructed in the Faith, was baptized, when hee was about 30 yeares of age, at the Feast of *Easter*. Moreover, *Idem Generat.* 14. *Constantinus* the Emperour, born of *Helena* the Christian Queen, was by Christian Priests converted to the Faith, and was baptized by Pope *Silvester*. *Historia tripartita, lib.* 1. *Bibliorum de Trinitate*. *Theodosius* the Emperour borne in *Spain*, his Parents being both Christians, was even from his youth instructed and educated in the Catholick Faith, who faling sick at *Thessalonia*, was by *Achalio* Bishop of the City, baptized, and thereupon recovered of his sicknesse.

Page 21. *Pontius* the Son of *Markus* a Christian, was Catechised

 and

and instructed in the Christian Religion, and afterwards was baptized by *Pontiano* the Bishop.

Page 22. *Nazarius* the Son of a Christian woman called *Perpetua*, imbraced and followed his Mothers Religion even from his tender age, who being Catechised & instructed by *Lino* the Pope, received also Baptism. Also, *Tecla* and *Erasma*, Daughters of *Valentinian* a Christian of *Aquilea*, were in the dayes of *Nero* the Emperour instructed in the Faith by their Father, and brought up in the Feare of God, who being Catechised by *Harmagora*, were baptized in a running water.

And now let the *Reader* judge, whether these Testimonies against the practise of baptizing Infants of old, have not much more in them, and are worthy of much more credit then Mr. *Philpots* Testimony for it, together with *Austin* and *Ierom* to help him.

X L. *Querie answered.*

1. *Whether faith or the profession of Faith, be the only or best ground whereon to build a Baptismall administration*, we shall not need to dispute; it is sufficient that according to Scripture, it is such a ground, as without which baptism was not administred to any (that we can finde) in the Apostles dayes, and therefore we say, neither ought it now so to be.

2. If the *Querist* thinks that the Apostles did *insist upon believing, or a profession of believing, in such men and women as were baptized by them, onely for want of better grounds*, as supposing there were better to be had, let him but prove it, and I will think so too; Or else for my part I think they had no reason to expect better then those which were every way sufficient, or then such as God had appointed for that purpose; or if God did appoint any other, why does not the *Querist* produce us a copy of that order or Appointment of God?

3. The *Querist* puts the Question, whether Faith, or a Profession of Faith in order to Baptisme, *were insisted on meerly as, or because such in their absolute or positive nature, or whether not rather in respect of their relative natures and properties?* To which I answer, that for my part I am of the *Querists* minde as unto this, that it is altogether irrationall, yea indeed I thinke a thing so irrationall as never entred into any mans head to thinke, *that Faith or a profession of Faith, should be required of men in order to*

Baptiſme, ſimply for Faiths ſake, or meerely for profeſſions ſake.

4. But though we are not ſo abſurd as to hold Faith neceſſary to Baptiſme only for faiths ſake, yet it does not follow that then we muſt needs hold with the *Queriſt*, that Faith is no otherwiſe, or in no other reſpect to be inſiſted on as neceſſary to Baptiſme, *but onely as it is Significative or Declarative unto the Baptizers and others, of the happy eſtate of thoſe in whom Faith is, as being perſons in the Grace and Favour of God.* For if perſons being in a happy condition as touching Gods love to them, be not the adequate reaſon why he would have them Baptized, then the knowledge of this that they are in ſuch a condition, cannot be the adequate reaſon of Mens admitting them to Baptiſme; becauſe the reaſon of the ones participation, muſt be the reaſon of the others admiſſion of them to that participation, and Gods reaſon of appointing Baptiſme to be adminiſtred to men, muſt guide and limit men in their adminiſtration of it in reſpect of the perſons to whom they doe adminiſter it.

But now that perſons being in a happy condition already, is not the full and adequate reaſon why God would have them baptized, but rather that they might be yet in a better and more happy condition, is moſt apparent from the end of all Lawes and Ordinances of God given unto men, and therefore this among the reſt, *viz.* the further good and benefit of men to be promoted by them; for otherwiſe they would be no argument or token of his love to them: And why elſe ſhould God impoſe the uſe of them upon his Creature? Certainly it is not becauſe God ſtands in any need of them, or of their uſing of them, but becauſe his Creature hath need of them, and may be bettered by them. *Deut.* 10.13. *Mark* 2.27 *Job* 22.3. & 35.7.8.

If then the good of men, that is a further good, be the reaſon why God would have them Baptized, then Faith becomes requiſite here unto upon this account, *viz.* not to declare them in good condition already, but becauſe it is that qualification or mean, without which the ordinance will doe them no good, without which the end of Baptiſme is not attainable, unleſſe we will needs be of that Popiſh Opinion, to thinke that the Grace of God and good of the Ordinance, accrues meerly by the worke done, which opinion, its very probable, gave the firſt being unto Childrens Baptiſme.

Faith then is to be insisted on in persons to whom Baptisme is to be administred, not for Faiths sake, nor yet simply as it is declarative of their being in a happy condition in whom it is, but rather as it is declarative of this, *viz.* that those persons in whom it is, and that by means of it are in a due capacity to receive that good by baptisme which God intends men in it, and so the proper subjects of it.

5. That, it seems, which much inclines the *Querist* to think that Faith was insisted on by the Apostles as necessary to be found in those to whom they administred baptisme, only as declarative of their being in a good and happy condition, and which would not so have beene insisted on by them, could they have come to the certaine knowledge of that their good condition any other way, I say that which it seemes inclines him thus to thinke, is this, because otherwise hee cannot tell how to conceive that Christ should be a meete or duly qualified subject for this administration, hee having no such Faith as the Apostles required in those whom they baptized, nor does he think that any man will presume to say, that he was baptized either contrary to, or besides the rule or minde of God touching persons meete to be baptized, especially considering that himselfe renders this account of his desiring of and submitting to baptisme, *viz.* because it *became him to fulfill all righteousnesse*, *Mat.* 3. 15. To which I answer.

I will not indeed presume to say, *that Christ was Baptized, either contrary to, or besides, the rule given by God, touching persons meete to be Baptized*: But yet it will not therefore follow, that *Johns* knowledge, of the good and happy condition that Christ was in, in respect of Gods love to him, was the only and adequate reason and ground of his administring baptisme to him. For though all the ends and reasons of administering Baptisme to others, did not meete, or were to be found in Christ, to render him a meete subject of Baptisme, as *viz.* Repentance for Remission of sins, yet there were severall things in Christ, obvious to *John*, besides his being in the favour of God, which in common with others, rendered him a meet and capable subject of baptisme. As

1. The confession of his Faith, or which is the same, the declaration of himselfe to *John* after such a manner, and upon such terms, as by which *John* did perceive him a person meet to be baptized:

for

for otherwise how should *John* come to know that hee was such an one? for till he came to be baptized of him, it seemes he did not know him to be the Son of God, as he himselfe testifies *John* 1.31.33.34. And however, if *John knew that Christ was the Son of God, either by his confession or otherwise*, he knew also, that he did believe himselfe so to be: which very faith being found in another, *viz.* of believing Jesus to be the Son of God, rendered him a meete subject of baptisme, according to common rule, as we see in the Eunuch, the profession of whose faith, and upon which *Philip* did baptize him, was but this; *I believe that Jesus Christ is the Sonne of God*, Acts 8. 37. And why should not the same faith which rendred another duly capable of baptisme, render him capable of it in like manner?

2. Another common reason of admission to baptisme found in Christ, was his professed desire to obey the righteous Law, institution, or declared Will of God, in being baptized, though perhaps in other respects, he had not that need of it, as others that received it had: *Suffer it to be so now*, saith he to *John* i.e. forme to be baptized by thee, *for thus it becomes us* (i.e. himself and others) *to fulfill all righteousnesse*, or every Law, or Precept of God, whereof this of Baptisme was one. And though *John* as it seemes otherwise judged Christ to have no need of his baptisme, yet upon this profession of Christs desire to obey God therein, and his declaring it necessary, and comely for him so to doe, *John* did baptize him; for the Text saith, *Then he suffered him*, Mat. 3. 15. And I desire it may be observed, that the true reason of Christ his being baptized, is here rendered, and that is, not his being in the love and favour of God, as the *Querist* supposes, but partly his desire to fulfill and observe the same law himselfe, which was imposed upon other men; and partly because of that meetnesse, or comlinesse that was in such an act of obedience or conformity to the Will of God as that was; which may well shame those, who thinke themselves exempt from water baptism, because they have attained more otherwise, then those new borne babes in Christ, were wont to have attained, at the time of their taking up baptism: Christ, though hee had not that need of Baptism as others had, yet he desired to shew himself as obedient as any in stooping, though it had beene to the lowest ordinance, and least command of God.

3. That

3. That account which Christ had now given, of his knowledge, faith, and desire to obey God, might well be a reason for *John* to conclude, that some good and blessed effect would redound to Christ upon his taking up that Ordinance of baptisme, as indeed there did; for there upon the holy Ghost descended upon him in the likenesse of a dove, and likewise a voyce from the Father, declaring his high contentment in him, saying, *this is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased*, Mat. 3. 16. 17. And this reason of *Johns* administring baptism to Christ, was much of the same nature with that ground upon which other men and women were wont to be baptized: For their declared qualification, of their Knowledge, Faith, and Desire to obey God, was still a ground to him that did administer baptisme, to believe that the ordinance would not be in vaine to them, but a means of much blessing.

And therefore, unlesse some such qualifications as these, could in some measure be found in Infants, to render them capable subjects of baptism, as well as Christ, there is nothing at all to be inferred from Christs being baptized, to justifie the administration of baptisme to them. Neither on the other hand, is there any thing duly to be argued from *Johns* administering baptism to Christ, to prove that a profession of faith, and a willingnesse to obey God, is not necessarily required in all persons whatsoever, to whom baptisme ought to be administred.

The premisses then considered, it is so far *from being as evident as the Sun at noon-day that all persons*, and particularly Infants *who may be known to be in the love and favour of God without a profession of faith, are without faith, or a profession of faith, as regularly and compleatly qualified for baptism, as the lowdest professors of their faith under Heaven*, as that the quite contrary thereunto is evident, if not as *evident as the Sun at noon-day*, which any but those that are blind may see, yet evident enough to be discerned by considering men.

And thus, though I have not said all that might have been given in by way of answer to these Queries, (for then perhaps as much might have been bestowed upon one, as now is upon them all;) yet I hope by what is said, there are such hints of light delivered, as by a rationall improvement whereof the *Reader* may easily come at ample satisfaction touching the cases of conscience therein debated.

FINIS.

UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY Library of the New York

New York